

PROCEEDINGS

2014 NCAA CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

108th Annual Convention
January 15-18, 2014
San Diego, California





THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222
317/917-6222
NCAA.org
AUGUST 2013

NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.
©2011 by the National Collegiate Athletic Association

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

DIVISION I GOVERNANCE DIALOGUE SESSION

**THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2014
SAN DIEGO CONVENTION CENTER
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA**

THURSDAY AFTERNOON

JANUARY 16, 2014

(The Division I Governance Dialogue Session, held on Thursday, January 16, 2014, was called to order by President Nathan Hatch, Atlantic Coast Conference serving as Chairman.)

CHAIRMAN HATCH: Good afternoon, comrades and friends. I am Nathan Hatch, and I would like to welcome all of you to this dialogue about governance of NCAA Division I athletics. I have been privileged to chair this Division I Board this year and also the Steering Committee working on those issues. Let me begin by introducing the members of the Steering Committee who have worked so diligently in this process that joins me on the platform today.

Gene Block, a Ph.D from the University of Oregon, and Chancellor at UCLA since 2007. He also served as provost at the University of Virginia.

Rita Cheng, chancellor of Southern Illinois University since 2010, and served as provost at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. She earned her doctorate in management from Temple University and her MBA from the University of Rhode Island, and her actual specialty is governmental and not-for-profit accounting.

Michael Drake, chancellor of the University of California, Irvine, 2005. He is an alumnus of Stanford University and the University of California, San Francisco, and previously was vice president for health affairs at the University of California system.

David Leebron, president at Rice University and previously served as the dean of Columbia Law School. An undergraduate of Harvard, he specializes in Human Rights and International Trade Law.

Harris Pastides, has been the president of the University of South Carolina since 2008. He received his Ph.D from Yale. He served as vice president and dean for research and health sciences.

Kirk Schultz, of Kansas State University, he came from Virginia Tech and became the president in 2009. Before that he was vice-president of research and economic development at Mississippi State University.

I am deeply grateful for these colleagues for all the time they have invested in listening, interacting, brainstorming and working together throughout this year for the best of us all in Division I. Also, what is best for our younger institutions, for the conferences which we belong, our coaches and athletic administrators, most importantly our student-athletes' well-being, education and preparation for life. It is the goal for which we all exist. As we begin, let me thank the people who are familiar with this process Mark Emmert, president of the NCAA, who has one of the toughest jobs in America, but with great reliance and goodwill works to reform the NCAA into an organization that works better on all of our behalf.

Also, David Berst, who is the NCAA vice president, is also in Division I. I think almost everyone knows him and he knows why the NCAA was structured as it is today. He has been very helpful in understanding this history. Finally, I want to introduce Jean Frankel, who has been our consulting facilitator in our process. She has spent hours on this, and she has been helpful to the committee to forward the redesign of this process. She will be our Moderator today.

Let me also acknowledge that we have some people that helped in the process, the entire Board of Division I and let me ask them to rise, the ones that are here from the Division (*Applause*).

I would like to have the presidents to please stand. That is the Advisory Committee. Please stand (*Applause*).

I want to say something briefly about where I think we stand and what some of my comments are for this process. Sometimes the strength of an organization may generate these corresponding weaknesses. That is the case with the NCAA, which is often criticized as resistant to change and slow to move. The fact is that the NCAA Division I represents 346 schools. It is highly represented, led by our boards, committees and volunteers. Some might say grassroots represented. The change is slowly so that voices are heard. The problem is compounded by the different interests is represented within Division I. We are committed to change and deeply appreciate the things you have been involved in with these efforts. The Steering Committee has sent out to you for your review the template, but our purpose here is to discuss your comments and resolve these bylaws. Let me say this process is open and we still have a lot of work to do. Let me finish by saying it is the actions and responses by you and the committee engaged in addressing the fundamental issues that affect college athletics. It must become less focused on legislative detail, and more forward looking and strategizing. With this set of distinguished persons and outside expertise and advisement, with your input, we will proceed.

Second, I hope that governance reform will allow you to remain intact. Those representatives will let that happen, but what will need to be a change is that the NCAA grant, a level of legislative autonomy on specific issues to conference that come with greater resources. This will enable greater investment in the development of the student athlete in college and beyond.

Third, the Board must work to restore the memberships in the governance structure and will ensure better communication across Division. The Board must be more nimble addressing issues that keep you awake at night.

Fourth, the Board of Division I is working to re-engage athletic directors in the work of the NCAA. Their voices and involvement are essential. The NCAA, once their organization and board leadership has shifted appropriately to university president, and that will certainly continue, but athletic directors with the senior level practitioners that understand the complicated issues in our organization. They carry a huge responsibility for making college athletics work, and they are doing so.

Finally, I hope the Board will become a more active champion for core values that we represent. College athletics, like American politics, can, at times, seem all about the money. Fully aware of these pressures, the Division I Board must reassert the core responsibility of its member institutions to student-athlete well-being and serious academic purpose. Our student-athletes need to be prepared as fully as possible to face life after college.

The process we have been going through has been most encouraging and scores of you have been involved, and I highly, very highly think that we can come up with a solution that will indeed streamline the governance. Let me now ask my colleagues, in turn, to offer some of their comments for this governance report.

MR. BLOCK: I hope that our governance is redeveloping so that we have more students in the governance process and the responsibility for that. Second, I hope there will be different people involved in athletics and the presidents will be involved and all individuals involved in athletics that have a model

MS. CHENG: I would like to say that the committee has reviewed the model and poster. This poster that we have to keep the various organizations. And we have made amendments to the various viewpoints and in our behalf to have to go through this process, we will continue to offer and brainstorm, and we will be creative as a collaborative structure, and will streamline and reach out to the experience of the collective group, that we have a large representation that doesn't necessarily have one opinion.

CHAIRMAN HATCH: Mike?

MR. DRAKE: My hope is that all are empowered to have your voices heard. We come here and we would like to stimulate people to share their ideals and that we can pull them all together with our organization and do a better job of serving those student-athletes, and also that is on behalf of our students to enjoy the benefits of our programs. I would like to echo something that President Hatch said, that this is really a process that we are here today to allow you to speak, and we look very much forward to hearing your voices.

MR. LEEBRON: My gratitude is that you all have taken your time to be here with us today, and challenging us as a committee, that we produce something that is sufficiently clear, and have a chance to engage in productive conversation and contribute substantially to the work at hand. This is why we are here and we have produced some ideas, but we will have to come to a conclusion yet on that. Let me say that governance is the first part of this. My ultimate goal is that we will contribute to an organization that governance has enabled us to fully vent the values that we bring as representatives of colleges and universities fully and to the organization.

MR. PASTIDES: I would like to thank you, the NCAA, for letting this committee work on this project. I want to echo as well the fact that I am not an ongoing process person. I have a goal and I want to get to the end point that Robert makes, but as the professional tennis star once said, "Success is the choir of the division and the doing is more than the outcome." I don't normally bring in that philosophy, but I can tell you this process has been a good one and a fair one, and we are the market person, and we practice that today, and I would be nothing but disappointed if I have to listen to you this afternoon and tomorrow and we don't come up with some better structure. I am delighted to serve.

MR. SCHULTZ: I think the size of the room today is that this is certainly something that has got a great deal of interest and involvement in. I would like to see us to continue to create obligation, and all the people that want to see Division I athletics continue with great track records of success. I mean, athletic directors and commissioners, and SWAs, faculty athletics representatives, university presidents, all of those have the best interest in making the NCAA as great as possible as it can be. At the end of this, these are words I hope can describe the future governance and the future of Division I athletics: Nimble, strategic, collaborative, transparent. These are not always words that people will associate with the NCAA, but I think when we get to the end of this we are going to be in a place better than we are today. Finally, everybody will sort of give a little bit and make this all work. The presidents have to change in the ways we do things. We have to look at structures. We have to have everybody that maybe comes to the table saying what we have done in the past and exactly what we need to do in the future. No one needs to take the position that this is the way, that it is perfect up here. So, thanks for being here, and we look forward to the dialogue and look forward to coming out of this with a greater and better NCAA governance process.

CHAIRMAN HATCH: Thank you. It is now my privilege to introduce you to our moderator, Jean Frankel of Ideas for Action.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. So, as I have talked to you throughout this year at many many different meetings, and interesting this is the first time I've ever come into a room and people say to me, "What does everybody else think?" Guess what, now we are all in the same room, so you will have the opportunity to hear what some of them are saying. That is really important for me today. What I would like to say is for the first time in sixteen years that this is the largest attendance and the committee hopes this will be the future. Let's give them a round of applause for that (*Applause*).

So, I want to have a little bit of comment. I think this committee has done a great job and it has really been a team effort. You have provided great equipment for this process and really, really, I am looking forward to it. I echo the president's comments, and that it can be absolutely excellent conversations about some of the things that we will talk about. The real talent is why we are here today. So, one of the things we will talk about today is where we are and where we are coming from. That is in terms of the future. We all also will hear about the

work of the Steering Committee. I am going to get to the information portion tomorrow. Today, think about it in terms of what it represents and the team and so forth. One of the things I know the Steering Committee wants to hear from you is feedback. We have put it out where we are looking for dialogue and it is not a base model, not a legislative aid, this is a process. A few years ago we had a whole group in this room. What is different about this room? You are sitting at round tables instead of a school setting. It is a very important reason for that. We want you to not only talk to us but to talk to each other. This is collaboration, how to work with one another and see what people have to say on things. We hope that we will hear these things from the president's Steering Committee, as they talk to each other. We want to know what you want to know. Is there anyone at the table that anyone doesn't know? That is great. Let me say what is exciting is to get into the dialogue. I am going to talk for a few minutes about where we have been and where we are going. This is the beginning of the common ground. So we will have a little bit about our process. There are a number of certain modalities that we want, and you can see it, and we have bingo and all it captures so we can talk about a little bit about that. So, I am your Moderator and your guide and hope to present conversation. There are certain things I will comment and share with you, and how we can move forward. This is the group of modalities, this is sort of a shorthand experience. We will be hearing from them. This will be a series of how they are going to be together, how they deal with it and what some of this is. That is how it will work out. Another one is the who and what? That is part of the conversation. You know, I am disappointed, but this will possibly be part of the conversations at the tables in this room. We hope the conversations you have are rich and value. At most of the tables there is someone with a sign in front of them, because they are the facilitator. Right now, before you do anything, I want you to give a round of applause to those folks (Applause). We also have people that know that the one you are familiar with doesn't mean you are not going to have a meeting. They are part of the conversation, and their job is to help your conversation move forward and help everyone in participation for this whole experience. When you have a presentation, there will be folks stationed in various parts of the room with microphones and they will call out and you can raise your hand if you want to share something, and they will come over to you and will point the microphone towards you.

One of the things we want to do is to keep the process moving. While holding the microphone, they will want to hear from you and hear what is being said at your table. That is important, too. The other thing is that you all have a polling unit. If not, you can get them. This will allow you to provide some input. This is not voting equipment, it is polling equipment. Actually, those in the mid-stream, there is a number of ways we provide you this in the process. At various times in it we will give you all the legalities and the questions and to hear our perspectives and to have conversation. Let me say that is valuable for this time together. You know, we have all done dialogues in our institutions and other organizations that we have been a part of, but the theme is to deal with each other. It is folks that have experiences, you do have different roles, different parts of what you have done. So, we want to hear your experiences and your talks openly. We would like to hear, you know, when you talk about the dialogue that you have had the opportunity to learn from others and you know that is right. There is a person that is about to say, what if you are not hearing and understanding what they have to say? We encourage you to hear what people have to say. We are going to have conversation for various short periods of time, today and tomorrow, and you will find yourselves hearing what we are talking about. Unfortunately, in order to try and get every perspective, we will not do it for some extended time. It is before you, identify your viewpoint and we will share your talk. The facilitator will help you as well and I am just going to take this over here. The record is here, and you are at your tables. We hope that you will narrow your conversations and manage as much as possible.

If nothing else, in 2014, we hope to have common ground, so, we realize that consensus recognize takes a long time to come to the process, and helps us and it is very important to share our concerns. We ask you to have conversation, so, when you raise your hand, during the conversation, and ask for someone to get a microphone to you, you can share your thoughts at the tables as much as possible, but everyone wants to get in to it. If you don't have agreement at the table, everyone has to have a comment. That is the consensus of the room in the conversation. We have heard a little bit from your Steering Committee, who has talked about the progress, but it is sufficient to say the committee wants to get a lot of input from you in the next two days and extend it after that. That way I will be able to take steps to build the final resolution to bring back to you. We don't get to vote, we don't get to decide, just get to talk and try to understand some. That is for the members. So, let's talk about inputs, your

input here. How many of you have input? What do you have to do keep this close because we are going to have you speak as much as possible. There will be people at the tables to help you.

One other thing I would like to say is we have these conversations, to use some and take with us. So, we encourage you to use that email and it will be helpful to share your thoughts with the committee in consideration of the conversations we have in the next few days. I also want to let you know there is a hosting process. How many have that? You will have that engaged in conversation and have that in sharing your experiences, share things so that you are effective with what you have. If you can look around in the back of the room and across the front of the room, you will see monitors. Those monitors are dedicated to more than talk. So, it is great to get up and walk around and if you want to do that please feel free to do so. So, I am going to have a warm up. At your table, we are glad you can take a couple of minutes to see that and we will talk about it and share your hopes for the process. You will take a couple of minutes and talk about your processes as well. Now, recognize that it is a very short period of time. We will take 10 minutes to do this. (RECESS.)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: We will have a couple of minutes more and then we will proceed. You will get to know each other, don't worry. Are you ready to use these? Are you ready to use the polling practice? We should all have one of these, and if for some reason you don't, you can get one at the break. We are going to do some texting and polling later. So, we have several polling questions to get us started with the equipment, and a couple of questions.

Let's see the first test question. This is really an important piece of information. "What is your favorite house pet?" You can see it. So, your favorite house pet, but the numbers are cat, dog, hamster, bird, fish. So you have A, B, C, D, and E on your appropriate number on your pad. You have ten seconds to vote. Are you ready? We are voting. The polls are closed. There you have 72 percent is for dogs, wow, and we have one percent for a bird. The dog won by a million. May we have the second polling question, please? "What is your favorite color, red, blue, green, orange or purple?" Please vote as you have ten seconds for that. Again, blue is the winner so, we have dogs and blue.

The next question please. "What is your significant affiliation?" We want to find out who is in the room. You have three, FBS, FCS and D-I. Select your subdivision. This should not take too much thought. The polls will be closed in two seconds. And the answer is we have representation of everyone here. Okay. The next question, please. "Which most likely identifies your current role: President, chancellor, AD, FAR, SWA, conference staff or other?" Please use one, that doesn't take a lot of thought, right? Wow, we have 37 percent ADs and 10 percent others. Thank you. So we will use that for responses at various times and try to get a sense of the room and kind of satisfy what your thinking is so you can hear from it. I will give you a little bit of time for the discussion. Honestly, Dr. Hatch said I would have probably many, many of you folks in this room have been in some meeting that I have been engaged in some dialogue with you in the last year or so. But we thought it would be important for us all to start out at the same place. Also, we will start out at the same place, and that is what is it that we want to give you to achieve this? When we say "governance" the first thing that comes to mind is structure, and a lot of boxes and charts. When we talk about governance in the work that the Steering Committee has done, we talk about a broader conversation. It really has four components, and this chart should look familiar to you, as it is the model the Steering Committee used, and you-all sent it back with the four-point slides that Dr. Hatch shared with the members in the second email. How many have read that? How many of you people raised it? How many have done it years ago? So, this will get into our conversation in a while. The four pieces here are the principles of our governance, around what they think is important to use, to sort of guide and assist us in the process.

The second piece is what do you use to provide oversight and what the Board looks like and what the structure is, that composition and that sort of thing?

The third piece is substructure. How do you work with the organization and fully get done, and who are these committees and councils in the room and how to engage them in the conversation?

The fourth is the legislative structure, and how to make decisions and how important it is to allocate it. You will notice there is a piece at the top and a piece at the bottom. If you look at the organization and the whole system, we also have at the bottom programs and services and infrastructure that we have how a particular organization runs. We will not talk about those in the process. We're talking about governance and how decisions are made and how the work is processed. At the top there is also a box that talks about sharing goals. I know many of you are in your conferences and in institutions and many other parts of athletics of the Association, and have to do strategic planning, and it is really desirable to have that vision and then build the structure around that. So, we have some good work to look at what we did in 2004 that I will ask you to be involved in as well. It is the core values for the NCAA. So, in the middle of this model, we have the core values, and that really is governance. So, one of the things I want to talk about in many of the conversations with you is that governance is not just about structure. All of what you see in the model that the Steering Committee has shared, it looks like a lot of structure. But underlining, and they will share some ideas in a couple of minutes, the philosophy about other things, about the process, about how the work gets done and about culture and about how we need to work together and about what is important. So, those three things are really important; structure, process and culture.

What do you know about the current governance system? I spent a good part of last year helping the organization understand where we are today. So, this is from where we are today through this process to this new model. You know, if I shared this diagram with you, first of all, you need to look at the chart. Second of all, you can say if you had memorized it. Third of all, this is a confusing complex structure, right? So, what do you know about how things really work? We know two elements of this, how it was designed, and the design was a number of years ago. I think it was 1997 and 2008, 2007. We have multiple processes of design, and then you have the processes of how things are really operated. So, I spent about a year talking to folks. And I spent time with the membership listening to things. So, sometimes during that year I felt like I was a fire hose, hearing so many ideas and thoughts. I kind of felt like this guy. I will talk with anyone about anything, right? So, many folks have so many ideas about governance and not about the structure, but how they felt being a part of the system, but knowing about trusting each other and whether you felt franchised.

The first couple of things I shared my thinking with the Division I Board and we identified a couple of things. The Board agreed along with the subdivisions, what the realistics are. That is all the substructure that we have. It is very confusing. There was a strong sense of our voices were not represented sufficiently in that normal structure. There are all concerns expressed about the weakness overall. They didn't understand them. The common communication structure and process is important.

Another thing we talked about is that we are so focused on day-to-day kind of things that maybe there are not a lot of opportunities to talk about their favorite issues. So, one of the things that is interesting is getting people and folks in a room together and asking them, that you can have conversations about some of those big issues that are out there. That is things that you may be thinking. A lot of you said we are nostalgic for that time when we had those paddles, right? It was tedious and complex. But you, at least, were in the room together. I hope these two days will give you some opportunity to come together and have those conversations. But no matter what everyone says, you know, we had a tough year last year from crisis opportunity and everyone felt we had a desire to finally get to get to the top of the issue and report them. So, that is where we are today in the conversations we have had. So, what I would like to do is take a couple of minutes and the folks we have are dedicated to the structure, and some are not, to give you an opportunity, and if you are one of those folks at the table that has a lot of experience in the structure, share it with some that don't, while we are having this conversation today. If it is an important piece of thing that you don't understand, talk about it. The best opportunities for change, what should be preserved and what questions you have about the process. I will give you about 15 minutes for this conversation. So, think about the current system today, issues and questions and opportunities and change. (*RECESS.*)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: We would like you to send your comments to this email address. That is input@redesigndivisiononegov.org. We are ready to wrap this up. Thank you. Have we given you enough time? So, you can share your thoughts about this and have input, and that is dealing with redesign of the organization.

Are you ready to hear from the Steering Committee, what do you say? Are you ready to hear from the Steering Committee? Let's give them a round of applause for the Steering Committee. What do you think? Dr. Hatch is going to share a little bit with us on the history, how we got to where we were in August. I got all this feedback on the current system, how the Board went forward and charged the Steering Committee, and how the Steering Committee works in the process.

CHAIRMAN HATCH: The Steering Committee is worried that Jean will allow you to vote us up or down. I would like to say a word about the process. In the August Board meeting, the Steering Committee was set up. We have spent a lot of time together personally and on the telephone and have solicited broad input.

In October, we held a special session where we put together for today a variety of groups. It was a very helpful presentation with commissioners, athletics directors, directors of coaches association, athletic representatives, the Knight Commission, and a number of other groups. They were a craft, a template to have it and that's what you have now. Some of our work is just beginning. The Board will be discussing these things Saturday at our meeting and this group at an in-person meeting in Dallas in mid-February to continue the work. Our goal is to have something that can be voted on in the summer. Originally, we talked about April, but that is probably too soon given the needs of what we get from our complete input on it. We do want to move ahead and get something approved this week. Let me ask Gene Block to make some comments.

MR. BLOCK: Thank you. I will try to generate some shared values. We work hard, and we think we should be moving forward with the governance structure. Especially the first two; the first one is presidential control and oversight. We are academic institutions; we are educating student-athletes. The presidents and chancellors should be responsible for controlling oversight over the NCAA. That is one value. The same time we recognize that rarely are we the experts in the area of athletics. It is enormous on our campus and historically the NCAA will provide that talent as effectively as we should have. The governance structure must have a focus on leaders practitioners' confirmation. We felt strongly the oversight control was that effective and that is the importance of others providing the understanding and the insights into athletics.

MR. DRAKE: The collaboration has less hierarchy. As the process came together, David and I have worked on this. The other participants in this meeting, the first time it came from the various institutions, we came in the room with the perspectives that we brought with us, and quickly began working together as a group of seven people, and that was the best thing we could do and recommending for approval for the governance structure for the organization.

One of the things that helped me was to try and determine for myself, at least, you know, ostensibly can I only speak as one individual? So I asked myself who was it that defined the school or the conference? As the client, some group of staff or the sport?

I always tried to focus on the client as the student, and try to think about how this governance change will facilitate a better period for student-athletes and for the student broadly. That focus on who we were would make it a lot better on trying to determine what those ideas I thought was better for the student and advance forward. I want to say the process was that we had concerns as we began the process, as we worked through the month, particularly at our in-person meeting and the greatly common ground that they had the optimism to believe that we can do a better structure.

MR. LEEBRON: I would like to say that we quickly realized that we were doing very significant things that those and that those things have to be shared in terms of our values and aspirations are much more pertinent than things that were different about us. We all have quite different institutions, private, public, small, large, local source in terms of attendance. The values have to be brought to the table and that has brought us together. Among these things, I think we are really one. Most important, of course, was the student-athlete, and the second I would say is how I would describe an opportunity, and the great thing about intercollegiate athletics has been a part of the social pressure and opportunity to rise above expectation and surprisingly shock the world, and

some sense about what our student-athletes are able to do under a large range of circumstances. So, we have had context recognizing on the one hand the it is so much that united us, that on the other hand are important differences. One of the questions was really how do those differenced particularly should reflect in our ability to support student-athlete welfare? So, it is brought about this question of autonomy versus shared governance, and look at that as we go forward. That is a little bit more on the lines of student-athlete welfare, and where those might be in the issue, but a little more in the resourceful in the welfare and opportunities of our student-athletes who ought to be able to do so. All of this is under that larger tent of opportunity for all of us and shared values, and that brings us together both as educational institutions and in the athletics environment. So, that is the difference affecting the fact that these are a wide variety of different references and at the same time incorporate shared governance and things that bring us together.

MR. PASTIDES: While we did share values that we quickly identified, the values were shared as David said, regardless where we came from. But for the most part, we also brought diverse experience particular experience from Boards that we have served on, and those that have, and I did that as well. I have served on one of the publically-held corporation Boards and I have reported to a Board and I will not talk about it. Some of the Boards I have been on have been overly controlling. By that I mean they are micromanaged and not only insufferable, but they are relative ineffective. Other Boards are completely disengaged, that is what I call a rubber stamp Board and I don't particularly enjoy that. It doesn't take a lot of time, and you go and hear people say "Thank you." Once a year you get together and say "Thank you" and give you a little gift. But that is not the type of Board we want here. What we want, I think, is a Board that we are engaged with, but engaged differently in varying degrees in the important responsibilities of the Board. So, for example, in strategy we want a highly involved Board, where in the chaired way with the administration, that time I put my time and effort in as a Board member. I want to hear that I am involved in strategy and policies are developed, and I want to be involved deeply. Should there be any polices in the past, that I have given other Board members an opportunity to think about and weigh in on. On the other hand, legislation is probably not something that the Board is going to be the most involved with on an hour-to-hour level. We don't know what the power oversight of the due process, and finally, management, I am only one Board member that manages the NCAA. We have had an outstanding team led by Mark, very capable people. I don't want to be completely hands off either. I think what we have brought to you in the model is the model of an engaged Board, one that manages on your behalf. Frankly, to be strategic, to be involved in policy development in what I call the light touch. A light touch on management. That is what we could do with the model.

MS. CHENG: We really focused in our conversations on how we proceed and the model would have to have a common base. That is not only in the Board, but in the substructures to manage them, the legislation and the championship issues. So, that meant that our vision for the Board is outstanding committees, and that is the experts in the Association and perhaps outside of the Association. It also meant that our model of the councils needed to be comprised of the practitioners that perhaps understood the issues that were at hand, and also include effectively to debate and come to a conclusion on a particular issue understanding the impact of their work. And the athletics directors, the FARs, the senior women administrators, the conference representatives and other experts were envisioned to be part of that process to manage legislative and championship issues. We also spent quite a bit of time talking about how the Board interacts in a meaningful way. There wasn't an overly matched Board that felt they needed to redo the work of that council. So, in the model, the common basis was drive the most of our work in the prediction of that strong man governance structure, and the intent was to make sure we put people in various roles in that governance structure basic conference.

MR. SCHULZ: Certainly, we heard from many, many groups around the Board and everything, that we needed to take into account, in any sort of revised governance structure. One of the things we heard regardless of the particular group, is we made more streamlining advocacy to make the process valuable. We talked to you and people had different ideas to do that, but we looked at proposed Board structure boxes that you can see. One of our clear goals was to make that actual so that the NCAA and Division I athletics respond to the needs and things out there as rapidly as possible.

One of the other things we had was a very robust discussion, which means arguing a lot with the others up here, with the principles that we wanted to form the model. We moved them, some principles around and changed some things. All models are based on principles, but you better make sure there is some agreement on the principles before we start using those as the basis. We are not putting out principles that most of us don't support and would look at and roll our eyes and say, that is not really the representations of where we are. I think those are two different critical things. Finally, there is always a sub-sense that the five conferences put there model together and put it under your door, and that is what is sitting out there. That couldn't be further from the truth. We clearly heard from them and we have representatives of those up here, but we heard from lots of different groups, and the intent of the model out there is to meet the needs of the entire Division I membership, not just any particular set of conferences or particular set of rules.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay. So, what we have ended up doing, and again please note that this is not a model, it is brainstorming and select work of this group and their perspectives. From that we saw earlier, we have a diagram, that is simpler and there is little detail, but it begins to give us a sense of type of thinking.

Here is for your comments of conversations at your tables. What are some of the surprising things about this model? What are the significant things about this model? We are thinking about headlines with you. We are going to experience basically the entire morning debating in much more detail about each of the four elements of this model. We will give you the opportunity to modify it, to add things to it, to give your perspectives as to what you agree with or disagree with. What we want you to do is each of you to share your conversation about what it is. We would like to have a conversation for about the next 10 or 15 minutes or so of your impressions and individually as a group. The project is significant. Then what questions do you have for the Steering Committee? They talk about the process and some of the philosophy under which they have given you thinking. If you will email those questions after your conversations, we will take a break and share some of them with you and get some active conversation going from there. So, you will have 15 minutes. You can begin with what you have heard and then email your questions, thoughts and inputs as to a redesign Division I governance organization. (*RECESS.*)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: May I have your attention for just a second? The Steering Committee wants to hear your questions. So, we will give you just a couple of minutes and reconvene. We are going to go to it and give you an opportunity to ask some questions of the Steering Committee. We have a lot of folks around, so get your questions ready for the Steering Committee. We will give you five more minutes. Thank you. (*RECESS.*)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Get your questions ready for the Steering Committee. Do we have any questions? We got some over here and some over there. So, we are going to get the discussion going, and then break for a few minutes. We would like to hear from you. So, there are people located in various parts of the room. Hold up your little cards, A, B, C, D, the computer folks. I am going to ask you to flag down one of those folks with question that you have for the Steering Committee, and then we will ask one of the Steering Committee members to comment. What is the first question?

FROM THE FLOOR: I have a question. Where do the student athletes fit into the Steering Committee's draft?

MR. HATCH: I am not sure we have wrestled with that subject substantially, and I think the whole goal of the Board is perhaps for all athletes. I don't think that necessarily means it has to be discussed on the Board. That can be debated. That is something that we would like to address. We do have some comments.

MR. EMMERT: I know that in many of my conversations with this Committee, a lot of, if you move forward the model that the counsel has legislated authority, that provides representation across the conferences, that was the vision as I heard it, not just the Steering Committee but many as a practitioner and entity, and provide great opportunity for students to sit and be part of that process. I know that is how it works in Divisions II and III. They literally have student-athletes sitting and voting members on their management counsel, not unlike Division I. If you want to do something like that, you could sit students in the legislative process on the council roll

and where it works. I suspect you want to have the student input and at the beginning of the process and not at the tail end, and not being in a veto issue. How you can get in the early in gestation period to see if that is a possibility?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: We have a question over here.

MR. LEEBRON: This is not a determined model at this point. I should point out two phases and what we put forward. One might think about incorporating students into it, and we have not addressed yet. The Board is only chancellors and presidents. The Board committees, which would be shared by someone from the Board, are open to other membership. Some of those groups might be appropriate to include students as part of what those committees of the Board are. The other place on which identifies the council, one that is put out there, we have not made any decisions because we want to hear good questions like this, is in addition to this sort of number of slots in that group, it is a possibility that it could be at-large slots on that group as well. That is another interview that we have feedback on the model, and we want to hear from you how those at-large slots might be used, and the student representation might be something we would think about in terms of those at-large slots.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Any other questions? We have one way in the back.

FROM THE FLOOR: The question for our table is who is allowed in the room with the presidents, are those voting members and who appoints them?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Do you want to take that?

MR. DRAKE: That is a good question. This is one of the questions we asked ourselves as well. We have looked at a variety of models and the theme was the principle that they report under most of the time that presidents dominated it in a significant way. There are a variety of issues, that it would be formal conversation and perhaps the members generally thinking was more towards no voting members and other voting members. Again, we all saying these are the things we were considering and get feedback from you.

MR. BLOCK: There has also been some discussion of having a small group of very distinguished individuals, prestigious people that are not so associated with our universities or the NCAA to give us a national perspective and have some discussions. That is also in our discussion.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Any other questions?

FROM THE FLOOR: Give us examples of what was just mentioned. It also would maybe something that has not been processed or some betting process.

MS. CHENG: We did feel that it would be a nomination process for the Board, and that is one of the ideas that was put forth. The individual, we talked more about competency of individuals that might have a public relations, legal, financial, and experience with athletics, and then were not connected currently to our member institutions, and would carry a great respect across the county.

FROM THE FLOOR: The question at our table is whether or not this model can stand the current strategic plan given that authority is to be given greater to the staff?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Do you have any comments on that question?

MR. HATCH: Will you repeat the question?

FROM THE FLOOR: Whether or not this model can sustain the current strategic plan given that authority is to be given greater to the staff?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: That is the greater authority to the staff. What is your thinking? You are talking the NCAA Strategic Plan?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay. I'm not sure where we are on that. I guess the question is what is the role of the staff in implementing the structure in this Strategic Plan; is that right?

FROM THE FLOOR: Or the Board.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So, it is the Board and staff having to work the Strategic Plan. Do you want to talk about that?

MR. SCHULZ: I will try this. I think we discussed the general topic of the role of the Board in the terms of setting strategies links more closely with things effecting the NCAA. The Board does not have to do that now, but much greater parts of the respect of the Board to spend thinking time and work with practitioners on it. I think the balance of what went into what the staff does and what things the Board does. I think there are some are some dynamics that we are discussing back and forth. I think that what we want to do is to not keep this model out and discuss this at a higher level. These are the things, and then go back to the model and define it. It is clearly something that we talked about, and we will talk more directly about this as we move forward. It is a great question, one that we spent some time on and will spend a little more.

MS. CHENG: The model is potentially simplified, and the notion here is that the staff is complex, and we have so many different committees that the process has been challenged. I think your question really comes that we as a Steering Committee will need to address more in depth.

MR. HATCH: I think one thing that we assessed on the Board, it has been a passive Board and they act on things that come from other people. That is things from the legislative process or the staff, and I do think the Board needs to be engaged in the strategic priorities and work with the Executive Committee on what those priorities are and how to implement them.

MR. PASTIDES: I appreciate the questions in the room, the room needs to be comfortable to know that now and not be defined by tomorrow. We want to be competency based, that would argue for more people in the room, athletic directors, for example, and, on the other hand, we want to be presidentially controlled by presidents and chancellors to have the ultimate authority that would dictate fewer people in the room, and to accommodate that without voting status. What we have to have is models, a working model, and that presidents and chancellors in the room, athletics directors, FARs, SWAs and others, students, student-athletes, others in that next level down. That is staff, the next level down and plenty of them. That is not something that you are comfortable with. It is something we need to hear more from people about.

MR. LEEBRON: The more I think about it, the better your question is. I think we grappled with a piece of that. I think the idea was really not just the presidents, but with what is being called the councils, to make that proactive. We will talk about who was in charge of strategy polices, and that is what area we actually show both of those students have an important role. It is not just coming out of one group. The council has envisioned incorporating folks from FARs, ADs, SWAs and others. They are really given an enhanced role to athletic directors and will help the black body play a very significant role in formulating policy and strategy and working with the Board. I want to go back to the last point that was mentioned a couple of times, and I think it is very important. That is thinking about the committee and the Board, the standing committees and the temporary committees. Those committees will not solely, as committees, have presidential Boards. They will come from like we talked about when we talked about policy strategy. As I understand your question, it was a conscious effort to move to these groups, to the ADs and other people. The labor practitioners implore you to grow along with the presidents and along with those groups to play a more active role in thinking about policy and strategy.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Any other questions?

FROM THE FLOOR: So, at our table we have been talking about the concept you mentioned

around the competitive opportunities. So, the question that we have is why not consider the different prescription models? If you do have autonomy at a certain level where they may have advances that continue to accrue, the differences between those five and the rest become greater, we have national championships that include all, so how do you maintain competitive opportunity for everyone and not just for those that are significantly different?

MR. DRAKE: Let me say that is an important question. That is part of goal is to help make this committee addresses the competitive opportunity building into a field team and people no matter where they are to have the core programs. That is opportunity to make it so popular and so good for the country. One of the things I think we don't want to do is to be able to require so much in the way of funding, that you have to eliminate sports. That would be, yes, protecting opportunities and one certain thing and decrease opportunities that student-athletes have. That is a serious consideration underlying a lot of our discussions in that.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: I have a question. Is it possible to consider uniform representation for these people on the Board, a uniform representative from each conference on the Board?

MS. CHENG: We discussed that at length yesterday afternoon and it would take about four hours of discussion in our group, that we would defiantly be committed to one Division I and total of one Division I and potential for a smaller strategic and recognizing that we all are different and at the current time there are some conferences, that is something that that group ask that we consider. The timing, the balance of shared governance are really the challenges we will have to discuss.

FROM THE FLOOR: Our table would like to follow up on the last question. Is the weight of the voting structure going to continue?

MR. HATCH: I don't we have settled on that.

FROM THE FLOOR: I know that most questions have been about who we are putting in the boxes, but we have a question about the structure itself. What is the reason behind the academic sub council being put off to the side with the dotted lines as opposed to being underneath the council and a hard line selection of championships and legislation?

MS. CHENG: Well, academics was one of the core principles we discussed and we are very conscious of the academic reform process that we just undertook. And that process needs presidential leadership and involvement more so than some of the other legislation we had litigation. We thought it was some core to what we were doing that we needed to have some connection to the Board, whether it is to this depiction or something else. That was really the basic thing.

MR. LEEBRON: So, we all on the same wave length. I don't recall why those dots. It seems to me the critical point is the lines to the council and the Board of Directors. At least for my recollection it should probably be solid lines instead of dotted lines.

FROM THE FLOOR: I think many of us came to this with the assumption that one of the benefits of the process, the Board would be more oversight and the practitioners would be the day-to-day operations. When I first looked at the document, that is through the council, yet our table is saying there are a lot of references to the Steering Committees and Ad hoc Committees, they were all bundled up to the Board that would be comprised of athletic directors, SWAs, FARs. So, we are confused as to the difference between the council and all of those Ad hoc Committees, and how different that is than what we are arguing about today? There is various groups that have access to the Board and you can't tell where things are coming from.

MR. HATCH: We discussed that contention among ourselves. I don't think that the intent is to empower the council to do the day-to-day work. At the same time, there is something all about the Board that works as a committee as a whole, and you don't have members of the Board and committees that look at special legislation of the NCAA and work with the staff to evaluate how to do it. So, I realize the challenge, but hopefully

that can be worked out.

MR. BLOCK: I think that is a great question. When we were working on putting together the model, which you articulate first is that the practice, if you want to use that term, have a more significant goal. If you want to talk about more committees, we had some dialogue about the fact that we don't want to set up two parallel structures to put this group, the competency practitioners group together that handles the day-to-day operation and duplicate by subdivisions of the Board. I think that we need to flush this out a little more. We want to make sure we don't do that, and that we will have subcommittees that will make sense for the time the Board needs to deal with and not duplicate. I think there is no desire on this committee's part that anybody on your part, to put two structures in place with things that are essentially already there. And we don't want to do that.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Tomorrow we are going to get into much more detail and have an opportunity to develop into these elements and suggest how you might do it. So, we have one more question and then maybe we will take a break.

FROM THE FLOOR: Most of us described at our table what is the size of the Board. The question was the Steering Committee if you contemplate or discussed a smaller Board, a much smaller Board, maybe not more, that it might be eight to ten people?

MR. HATCH: I would say discussions are ongoing. There is a sense that I don't think the issues of the Board have to do with the size. That has been too cumbersome. In the end, the Board does have to have the quality representation, and requires competence, and I think we are comfortable with the size of 18 to 20 that is working and populate committees. That's our thinking, but nothing is fixed.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: We have feedback from another one. From the input, how about 17 Board members? How can a Board member be one?

MR. LEEBRON: We have a variety of experiences and our Board is 15 people and functions like a 15 person Board. I think that is fairly limited. A size of a Board can't be too big and they need executive committees and that brings on another set of consequences. I think the impression the Board took that it could be too big to function in a very official kind of way. It seems that from our experience that these numbers weren't really the obstacle. It was really a question if the Board gets bogged down in things it should not be getting bogged down in? I think that the creation of the council and empower the council and these are really very good questions, that it is not that an addition in the model, the model is unspecified in that regard. If you don't change it, then the Board can be able to work. We have to empower the council and defer to the council really the critical part of this. I would say that most of this is 17 or 18 as functioning radically different. Some corporate boards are six, some are nine, some are 15. The universities boards probably range right now from six to nine to 50, so the experiences that we brought into the function of our boards is that a group of about 20 people can function and that they can take on the right tasks and build the right set of relationships and structures.

MR. DRAKE: I agree with David on that. That is one of the areas we were talking about. Something that occurred to me in listening to all the questions that I just want to say we got together and asked ourselves these questions and kind of came to a reasonable place to start further discussions. The question of that "Why is the Board 17?" I think that the Board could be 25, or should be the Board be 10? I think we are thinking about that today. From the questions you are asking it could be the position that I got there. That is part of the discussion we want to have in the process as it moves forward.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Thank you. We are going to continue this conversation. Please keep your questions ready. We are going to take a break and continue this conversation. We are going to take a 10 minute break. Thank you so much. *(RECESS.)*

MODERATOR FRANKEL: It is time for us to reconvene. Thank you for your questions, and we are going to continue to compile those and use these periodically throughout our time together. One of the things

that is important to note is that the Steering Committee has been getting membership input throughout this process, and President Hatch talked about the history of the Steering Committee, how in August, we took some of the feedback, and in October we heard from eight or nine groups with the combined board of the Steering Committee and had conversations. We continued our conversations throughout the process throughout the year. This is one place where input has happened, and input has been shared with the Steering Committee. I wanted to just highlight for a minute, and talk about the Leadership Council. The Leadership Council, for those that don't know, is a group that has representation from all 32 conferences and it typically is to assist the Board in operating strategic matters. This year, the last year, we have devoted a significant amount of time to help with the governance thought process, and to pioneering in kind of small groups over conversation. So, I think it is important to note that we have been getting feedback. I want to bring Larry Morris, who chaired this, to give you a little bit of some of the headlines on what the Leadership Counsel has provided and the differences and continues to do that in the process.

MR. MORRIS: Good Afternoon. Thank you for being here today. This is a good representation of you at the NCAA Convention, and to see everyone here today. As she mentioned, the Leadership Council has been extremely active in discussing relative to governance. We have dedicated to that purpose. We started this back last April when we brought the Leadership Council together to begin a more broad strategic discussion. We created what we call the environmental stand and tried to come up with some of the more important questions that the Board should be thinking about as they move forward. That was in April. In July, we talked more about core values, and I would like to echo what was mentioned by the Steering Committee. In that conversation, we found that we did have more comment than differences, and we should make sure that we ensure that the commonality continues and tried to bring our differences more into cohesiveness, if possible. Some of the core values we talked about was student-athlete welfare standards and integrity, and institutional control; sports friendship and university inclusion. Those are the things that we discussed as we moved forward. In our last meeting in October, we really developed into the governance and how this whole process should work, and try to give the function to the Board and the Steering Committee on how to move forward. We had diverse people together at one table so we could hear from different subdivisions, different positions within it, and the athletic directors, and those diversity agendas, and a full conversation. We are hoping that happens at the tables today. So, in front of you are some of the ground rules we knocked out. It is very important that you do this at your tables, a fair and honest communication. If you don't talk about what your positions are and why you feel that way, then there is no way we can have a dialogue. Within that dialogue, it is skeptical. Let the voices be heard and try to have an effective debate in which we can try to come to some conclusions. We talked a lot about members given process, that only in terms of what the issues, are but the structures that are put into place, a method of agenda and a question about the staff role asked earlier. When they do take ownership of the agenda and what our issues are, and then help the staff to assist in that regard. So, those are the things we talked about as ground rules. The last point is to seek improvement, not perfection. A lot of people think that actually works and we have to figure out what part doesn't work and try to make that better. In terms of our goals, the process we have talked about, this would be what we talked about previously, but focused on student-athlete well-being. We clearly have that goal. I don't think there is no one in this room that would not agree. We talked about membership. As a group, there are members of the Leadership Council that do believe that the Board should be the institution, and they have talked about that as well. That is the substructure, whatever those will be called, and needs to be involved in practitioners so we can vet out issues and get those to the presidents in a meaningful way. As already mentioned, make sure at your table you discuss the experience of someone who has done this, who has given contributions to that particular talk at the table they are sitting at. Most importantly, that they are engaged and they are committed to the right thing. Finally, we talked about inspired eloquence. We have talked about these earlier, but everyone should have in the redesign of this context, of the redesign everyone should have the opportunity to do that. The fact that we have 2000 people here today proves that has been fulfilled in some respect. We have insisted on communication, and that is part of what we talked about is to have consistent communication. You have to be from each structure. So, we talked about it earlier, maybe you have some elaboration or connection between the Leadership Council yourself to insure there is consistent communication. I think that one is the rebuilding of trust. There is a lot of distrust

not only in the structure, but people who serve in the structure because we don't understand their role currently, and the conversations they are having. So, we need to rebuild trust in the system as well as the folks in the system, and then the communications between those entities. Finally, once we get to the governance redefined and completed, we need to use the structure that has been created. I think one of the problems, and many of you know, that we have too many structures happening now, what is in the legislation, and then some of the outsiders and the people don't know when and where to engage. So, they step back. We created a system that is very organized and very practical, and then as practitioners will want to engage in knowing their voice counts at the table. There are so many tables and so many voices, and we are not hearing which voice is the most dedicated type. The Leadership Council, I am very proud of the work they have done and at this point I would like each of the members of each of the councils to stand and be recognized for the hard work they have done and will continue to do and we move forward. (*applause*)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Now, even though it is 20 after four, let us begin the process to really pick apart this model and the presidents have shared their thoughts and want your feedback. This gives us a common part to start. We will see what the conversation will accomplish. Let's start, and we will continue tomorrow with each of these four elements. So, we will talk about substructure and a lot more, and help you understand how these pieces fit together, and talk more about the governance and legislative structure, which we have not talked about today. We will spend a lot of time on it tomorrow. Before I started today in the framework, I talked a little bit about core values. Core values is the essential foundation to this model. They are the center of this model, and 10 years ago, in an effort to evolve the business of the NCAA, we had some conversation about core values and the interesting thing is there is more today as an assessment to what is important and what should not be changed about the organization. Core values are things that help guide and manage the decision-making. They are things that are common beliefs that we know we may have different goals, we have common set core values and then bring these together. So, the Steering Committee is thinking about core values as a basis for conversation, and before we let you have some conversations about core values and how you see them in this process, let's hear from a couple of Steering Committee members about your thoughts about the core values and how that is essential conversation.

MR. HATCH: I do think the Board should be more involved in thinking about the core values and assessing whether we are living up to practicing them. I think that is one of the advantages that will free the Board of much responsibility in doing that. The core values are like saluting the flag and examining our practice, what we would say we are about.

MR. DRAKE: I can say a couple of things about value. We used the value in every decision process in our employment. The values are a couple of things you do and you answer the question why am I doing this? Because I believe that collegiate athletics is an important core and that it is important. The core value is why you are doing what we are doing. I think an organization like ours, that we have good people doing good things for good reasons, and then find themselves in trouble. I believe as you look back to the cause of that trouble and it is deviation from those core values. We are, in fact, good people that are doing a good thing for no reason, and we stick to our core values we will have good outcome. We come back and say here is someone that knew what the core values were and moved away from them, and then we moved forward. I think in the process we are talking about, the concepts that have brought us to this discussion is the structure and that it can be more liberal and effective, and actually work together and build the trust. We think that is very effective. That doesn't fall out of the sky and that it is working together for a common goal as those core values will be decided as you move forward.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So, the core values are really a foundation of building a house and building that foundation. Core values also have to do with what I would say like passing the builder's test. They need to do it. Especially, the environment we operate in, there is a lot of public understanding or lack of understanding perhaps what we are all about. It is very important that we have an understanding and we are embracing those core values. The important thing about core values is the support and others believe them and understand them. We are going to take a couple of minutes at your tables and have some conversation about these core values. What is the core values? Ten years ago, are they still appropriate and relevant in today's environment? Are they

being realized today? Which ones are we leaning to more than others? Which ones are most difficult to achieve? Which ones are most problematic as we use them to provide our thinking and decision-making? And which ones do we think are the most significant and most positive in going forward? We will give you about 10 minutes for this conversation, and you can provide your input in the email and we will get the answers to those. Thank you (RECESS.)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: We will have some more comments on the core values. We want your thinking on the core values and the most difficult ones to achieve. What do you think about core values? Are you for them or against them? What do you think about the core values?

FROM THE FLOOR: It concerns me that the core value is graduating student-athletes with degrees in higher education for the labor market.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Any other comments? No one else has a comment? Who else has comments?

FROM THE FLOOR: I think there is some general consensus at our table. The first bullet point is the core value and it needs to be in the revenue producing sports where you are not meeting it.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Will you describe that?

FROM THE FLOOR: It is the application. You are on this program the entire year and they didn't get monitored in the summer, Christmas, and they are putting in more hours and they don't survey this on the athletics side or in the classroom or any place else. That is how we describe how our core value is. We are missing the two as greater sports.

FROM THE FLOOR: One of the things that seem to be missing from these core values is what role do we have as educators in athletics? There is some loud cynicism in respect to integrity in sportsmanship. Part of the reason I say that is because there are decisions that schools are making across the country with respect to who they are hiring and integrity of those people who are being hired, that have no business being in collegiate athletics. My question is today the president calls their colleague before making that hire and say what in the hell are you doing? That is nothing to do with education.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Thank you. What about other core values? Is there anyone in the back of the room that has a question?

FROM THE FLOOR: I would like to talk about having one of the core values be to help the student-athletes. At our table, we were hung up on semantics. Are these core values or are these values?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So, core values we are saying they are deeper than this, they are things like--

FROM THE FLOOR: Like what is the overall part of the dealing with this gets to the first bullet point. But it is education, are they truly application? I heard the comment that was made, for some of us, absolutely it is. For others in this room, no. But it is mixed in two or three sports, not so much.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: The question is, are these core values being practiced? Are they really being used?

FROM THE FLOOR: Correct. That is the curriculum part of this whole discussion. Are we going to go back to these or making decisions to come back with guiding principles? Does that make sense?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Yes. These as core values, for organizations to see these things focused and they get it right and say are we doing these, where are the most problematic and what things are chang-

ing in our environment that we really need to address in order to use these core values successful and maybe front and center? Do you think it is important to have these in this conversation, to have this conversation about that?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yes. In following up on the last comment about core values, I think that you have --I know that you have this one segment on imposing segments on core values but I think there is a lot of stuff to that, too. And we can separate those out and it will serve us well in terms of ability to what are core values and what are governance is?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: That is true, and the experience is some of the thinking, and the fact that we have not talked about it, but your question was addressed earlier. It needs to be a Strategic Plan for Division I. We have talked about this 10 years ago. Could there be more specificity around sort of milking these values, and that it is important to have these front and center?

FROM THE FLOOR: Our particular student-athlete's success will be listed at the first core value. Secondly, transparency in efforts of members of governance should be a part of our core values?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Anybody back there in the back of room? Is there anybody that has a hand up?

FROM THE FLOOR: I would just like to say that this is an extreme core value. By definition that is how you operate in a nation. If you have the core values every year, we didn't get the job set in the first one. We revalue your goals and guiding principles, but every core value is what you operate under. So, that is why I think these should be a little bit more like you say more general, it should not change. That is absolutely who you are.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: What I really want to do is ask what are we really doing if we don't have the insight and you have a document and it comes out every 10 years. We don't look at it and that is exactly the same thing.

FROM THE FLOOR: Two things respectively to the institutions, it is hard to have a spectrum that includes athletics totally. Secondly, the presidential leadership, leadership needs to come from not only just presidents but also athletics administrators in both leadership and integrity.

FROM THE FLOOR: Our table felt very strongly in this culture is going to be one of our core values that we take intentionally in deliberative efforts to make sure. I think we have shown that with willing coaches and administrators, and a double-edge sword for our coaches and administrators, so, it is going to be a core value, there should be a strategic effort concrete that we evaluate every year. Once every two years is not going to get it.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: We understand. Any other thoughts about core values? Which ones are really up and doing well and which ones are not?

FROM THE FLOOR: I am a student-athlete and representing the student-athletes SAAC. The first bullet point that the collegiate model of athletics talks a lot about academics, social and on field portion of light. There is no discussion about the professional development, the fatigue and interviews and things like that. That is something we focus on in the classroom and on the field. But what about the student-athletes once they graduate?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: That is a broad one. Specifically, around the room with all the experience.

MR. BLOCK: Our group wanted to know specifically where the shared core value of leadership of the AD, and why the leadership rest upon the presidents only?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: I didn't hear you.

MR. BLOCK: Where is the shared core value on leadership for ADs, and why does it always rest on the presidents?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Presidents, were all leaders, right? That is clear. I think we have the conversation tomorrow about how, each group really sort of engages at what level. One important part of the conversation tomorrow is how is this engaged in and where does the leadership come from? That is going to be before us tomorrow. Any other thoughts about core value?

FROM THE FLOOR: This is more of an observation than a question. I challenge for any of us to be able to repeat the core values of the NCAA, because if you look up on that screen, I mean certainly it is pretty wordy.

So, our hope will be as we go forward there is a way that we can think about condensing that and conclusive, do we have the facts, integrity whatever that is? That is something that we need to have any of us to explain to our students and other people. It's just an observation.

MR. DRAKE: We have core values and decision-making, that is one of the things we do.

FROM THE FLOOR: One of the things I look at when we talked about core values is one of the things that we are really driving in revenue and not of means of our values being to support the mission of the NCAA or the institution or conference in driving revenue. Some point we need to look at what we are actually trying to do on our campuses versus what we say are our core values.

FROM THE FLOOR: I understand that there are not directors of athletics in each group. There are some groups in this room, however, and there is one group that stands three hundred sixty five days a year, twenty four hours a day, seven days a week devoted on this enterprise, and we should be included in the leadership clause.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Thank you. All right, we have one or two comments on values and we will wrap it up.

FROM THE FLOOR: First of all, I would like to apologize for the weather in San Diego. That is it. Our table was confused about the institution's core value. It was a sense that it might have meant something different than in the past, than it does now, but a way to keep us together, to have a level playing field in the past. And now with reference to institution versus values for a way to separate out possibly. So, we are unsure what that means at this point in time.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: I think we are actually suggesting a little bit wording change in the 2004, in that particular one. So I think that one has some consideration in this point. Any others? Any other thoughts?

FROM THE FLOOR: I would like to go back to the last speaker. It seems that the prior organization said we get our core values first, and then governance, and then we get to what is relevant. So, the governance then, comes back to support it after the core values makes sense to me.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: I will tell you that the Leadership Council has had some conversations as well about getting in that 2004 plan. In Division I, there has been some parallel work on that. Honestly, I had my druthers, I do think you need purpose values and mission first, and then strategy and structure. I think that we have had this 2004 plan, it should be part of our conversation, which is a broad parallel there.

FROM THE FLOOR: Our table is here in the rear. In the core values, we do them every day, and that works just well. They are the core values now, the values of completion, the leadership lessons that are learned there, how the student's career succeeds long term. We agree with Mike, we need a simple statement to describe core values at least.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Thank you. So, let's talk a little bit about what we have heard. We have about nine minutes left, and we can have a little bit more discussion. We will have a lot more of this conversation tomorrow. I want to say this as clearly as possible. I think you all did a great job today. We started with the headlines and not getting into a lot of detail. Give yourself a round of applause for that. I want to assure you that we are going to be able to get into a lot of detail tomorrow. We have four hours tomorrow, and it will be organized that we will hear from the Steering Committee in greater detail about each of those four components, about what they are thinking, what governance structure, about their governing body and the legislative structure. At the tables, you will have the opportunity to add anything that you want to modify what they have done. We need to get to another level of detail and we will do it. You will have that opportunity tomorrow. I am sure you will spend all the time today and tomorrow thinking about what to put in that. Before you leave that table I want to get some reflection from the Steering Committee on things that you have heard and things you thought were surprising and significant.

MR. PASTIDES: I will start it but the AD from NC State's comment about AD's in the room, got applause. I think we have referred to that silence well, but that is an important point that we have for tomorrow, and the presidents and chancellors will incur, nobody else, including working three hundred sixty five days a year in the business that you do. But to obviate perspective, my question back to you is being in the room possibly, is that the only way to have that perspective? That is what I would like to see some more dialogue about tomorrow.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Any other comments?

MR. BLOCK: I think that seeing validates what you said, we have to go back and involve in governance, that is what we are doing. We will have a specific date to begin listening and it has been very valuable and I thank you all.

Ms. CHENG: From my perspective I think the strong model works. It has generated productive and open conversation. We admit and reflect on things that we either didn't address in detail, but didn't get to because of time constraints, and we have not communicated in a way that we wanted to, particularly in the role of the AD. That has been something that has been on our agenda each time. Those are definitely starting points for further discussion.

MR. PASTIDES: This is repetitive, but I am surprised by something that said failed to communicate to our groups confidence in particular in Athletic Directors and our desire to give them a very strong leadership role in this process. I think that although we might disagree about we need to be in the room, I think that the last point that was made about the last core value in particular, I fully understand how articulated that is. The leadership really is something that has to be shared among all of us, and then throughout that we were trying to incorporate in that, and the last bullet point for me came across and was received as exclusionary rather than we want to make the responsibility that we do not have exclusion of others. I believe that we need to figure out how to articulate that point that really incorporates what we intended to say within those core values. I say that from, I think, my perspective. This has been an incredibly helpful conversation for us, and reassured us, and this came at least with specificity to promote the conversation and enough concern to incorporate the conversation.

MR. SCHULZ: I think some of the questions were to the pointed questions they have been very good and keep us thinking about things that we need to do to change. Whenever we put a model out like this, you have variety of reactions. Some people will say that it didn't go far enough. We were looking for some really drastic change, and all these did was tweak some things and different things. Some people will say we went way too far. Just like our campuses, it is to keep everybody involved and engaged, and the things we want to do is to not just here as we continue to tweak the process, and at the end of the day we never have something that everybody will say is okay, but we will have something that the folks will say represents well and have the right people in the right spot need leadership and the division we need to make the NCAA Division I a great successful organization. You stick with us and give us the feedback and keep being critical, and at the end of the day we will have a better product for you.

MR. DRAKE: I think one of the important things is to pick back up on the conversations that so many people were involved and good ideas from all across the room. If I would mention that, I think I will tell you that those ideas were coming from someone who is in law school, from student-athletics or commissioners, it is a great broad conversation like that. That is how close we are all to this issue and how perspective we can share, I look forward to doing that.

MR. HATCH: I would like to thank you for your serious information. Something like this is difficult to pull off. Thank you for taking it so seriously. Let me thank Jean for the purpose of this.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: One last thing. You have some homework, the homework is that you keep the presidents thinking about and reflecting what is the most important thing that you heard today? What questions, we have to make sure that we address them tomorrow. You did a great job, and we want to get some details and work on that tomorrow. So, please feel free to bring this tomorrow or send your email questions to the input@redesigndivisiononegov.org. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 P.M.)

PROCEEDINGS
of the
NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
ONE HUNDRED-EIGHTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
January 16, 2014

**SAN DIEGO CONVENTION CENTER
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA**

OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2014

(The 108th Opening Business Session of the National Collegiate Athletics Association, held at the San Diego Convention Center, San Diego, California, on January 17, 2014, was called to order at 5:30 o'clock p., with Lou Anna Simon, President, Michigan State University, and Chair of the NCAA Executive Committee presiding.)

OPENING REMARKS

Executive Committee Chair Simon: Good afternoon, colleagues and friends. I am pleased to welcome you to the Opening Business Session of the 2014 NCAA Convention. I am Lou Anna Simon, president of Michigan State University and Chair of the NCAA Executive Committee. I now formally open this session and welcome you to San Diego.

REPORT OF THE NCAA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

It is customary for the Chair to present a report of the NCAA Executive Committee at this session. The NCAA federated governance structure allows each Division the autonomy to address its varied issues. Clearly, while Division I Governance is drawing much attention, Divisions II and III have much to celebrate. However, it is important to stress that we gather annually at this Convention as one Association committed to the lifetime success of the student-athletes and strengthen the collegiate model. As a reminder, the NCAA Executive Committee is composed of 16 presidents and chancellors from the three Divisions, the president of the NCAA, three non-voting members, the chair of the Division I Leadership Council, and the chairs of the Management Councils of Divisions II and III. I would like to report briefly on one key action approved by the Executive Committee. Last year, the Executive Committee affirmed the support of the Association's core values and the need for board-based reform. An essential element of the reform is that indeed for meaningful change in the regulatory aspects of the Association to ensure that the Association's optimal position supports the lifetime success of student-athletes and to enhance a confidence and trust in member institutions and actions taken by the National Office.

We, the Executive Committee, expect nothing less than the highest levels of integrity and accountability in all endeavors. To this end, the Executive Committee commissioned an external and internal review of NCAA regulatory functions within enforcement, academics, membership affairs, and the eligibility center. Processes under review included waivers, enforcement, investigations and reinstatements. The goal was to access consistency, integrity, appropriateness and effectiveness on the various regulatory processes. The Executive Committee conducted interviews amongst its Division I, II and III members, ranging from presidents and chancellors to commissioners, athletic directors, compliance personnel, faculty reps and general counsels. A new report containing recommendations based on the ideas of members and the national office initiatives with the approval of President Emmert is to be considered by the Executive Committee in its meeting tomorrow. The intent is to translate ideas and concerns and actions that result in a much higher level of organizational effectiveness and member confidence. So, stay tuned.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION

Next, we will observe within the Opening Business Session a tradition as we honor athletics, staff members and student-athletes who passed away during the preceding year, with the Memorial Resolution report.

At this time I would like to ask all delegates and guests to stand and remember those men and

women associated with college athletics who passed away since we last gather in 2013. These individuals contributed a great deal to our shared endeavor and will be greatly missed. (*Whereupon, a moment of silent prayer is had at this time.*)

RECOGNITION OF RETIRING MEMBERS

Thank you very much. And, finally, as a tradition at our annual gathering, the NCAA is a member-association that is fueled by the work of our colleges, universities and conferences, and the hundreds of administrators who proudly support athletics and academic opportunities for student-athletes across the nation. The efforts of the administrators are tireless and many of those often go unheralded. So, at this time I would like to acknowledge and appreciate those in our audience who plan to retire during the 2014 academic year. Will you stand and let us thank you for many, many contributions to this Collegiate Model? Is there anyone retiring this year? (*Applause*)

It is now my pleasure to introduce the president of our Association, Mark Emmert, a person who really in this group needs no introduction. I want to thank Mark as he comes out for his relentless, positive action in the face of many obstacles on behalf of our student-athletes and members. (*Applause*)

NCAA PRESIDENT GERALD R. FORD AWARD

President Emmert: Thank you, Lou Anna, and welcome. So, it appears from up here that there are a lot of people standing in the back. There are 10 rows of empty seats up here. So, we are going to pause while you all come up here so that you can't escape during intermission. Do you want to come up? No? If you are looking for a seat there lots of them up here. Come on up.

Well, first of all, it is great to be here. This is the time of the year that I enjoy a lot because it is the only time really where we bring together all three Divisions and have an opportunity to talk about all the issues that each Division has to deal with, but also, all of those things that you and I are really at the heart of what intercollegiate athletics is all about. For all of us who work in the National Office and all of you who spend all of your time on your campuses working to support our student-athletes and to make this Association work so well, we are delighted that you are here. This is a wonderful venue. We have already had some terrific conversations, and I am really looking forward to what is going to happen in the coming days. One of the great opportunities that I get as president of the Association, that the president has for a long time been allowed to do this is to select and identify someone to win the Gerald R. Ford award.

Since 2004, the Association has honored someone who has had a life-long commitment to intercollegiate athletics and has made contributions over an extended career for all the student-athletes for the betterment of intercollegiate athletics, and has been named, of course, in honor of our former president Gerald Ford. I am delighted this year to present the Ford Award to Dr. James Andrews, who is internationally known for his skills and orthopedic surgery and for injury prevention, and who has pioneered so many technics and so much that we understand with sports medicine. A former LSU pole vaulter, Dr. Andrews has worked tirelessly to prevent and treat sports-related injuries, and he continues to do that today, and indeed, he has to fly back tomorrow because he has a number of patients that he is working with right now from the sports world. So, let's meet Dr. James Andrews. (*Applause*)

(*Whereupon, the video was played at this time*)

"Dr. Andrews: I always wanted to be a doctor. My grandfather, when I was just a young kid planted the seed. He kept telling me when I was a young kid that I was going to be a doctor when I grew up. So, it sort of fell together with everything, emphasising sports with academics, and I wanted to be a doctor. So, really what I really wanted to do was to be a team physician. In those days we didn't know what the words "sports medicine" really meant. But as it turned out, sports medicine became a subspecialty of orthopedic surgery. "As a team physician, that is where I wound up. You know, I started off in sports medicine about 40 years ago. We were neophytes in

sports medicine at that point, even though we were well advanced, and a lot has happened since then. “The biggest revelation in sports medicine, since I started, was relating to the arthroscope with minimal basic procedures and it revolutionized what we did in sports medicine. “But that all started in the early 70’s and I happened to be at the right place at the right time when all that was being developed. Of course, I was smart enough that you could say to say jump on that bandwagon and be an early pioneer in those days with that particular technic. Research and education is the most important aspect of my medical career. “The thing I am working on now, and I am so passionate about, in the twilight of my career, is the prevention of injuries in youth sports. That goes along with research and education, which is one of the reasons we started the American Sports Medicine Institute in Birmingham, and the Andrews Sports Medicine Institute Research and Education in Pensacola. Our devotion in the last 10 years has been to try and figure out how to prevent injuries in youth sports. In the year 2000, I started noticing in my examination rooms were filling up with 13, 14, 15 year old kids with adult injuries, torn ACLs, shoulder injuries and all different types of sports. I started trying to figure out what in the world was going on, and if we can keep these kids healthy and out of the operating room and on the playing field they will be able to benefit from all of the good things in sports participation, as we discussed earlier, will provide for them.” “So, that really is what my passion is with research and education and why I am so interested in our foundations. “You know everybody wants to be able to give back something, and so for me it was a matter of giving back to the sports and again try to keep these kids out of the operating room and on the field. I am proud of that. “I think, though, we just made a dent in it. I am still working on it. Believe me, we have a long ways to go and it is like my wife, Jenelle says: ‘If you still talk about what you did yesterday, you are not doing much today.’ That is sort of what I live by.”

PRESIDENT EMMERT: Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in welcoming our 2014 Gerald R. Ford Award winner, Dr. James Andrews. (*Applause*)

RESPONSE BY DR. JAMES ANDREWS

Dr. Andrews: That’s wonderful. Thank you. President Emmert, Chairwoman Simon, ladies and gentlemen: Who would have believed that a small town southern boy from Homer, Louisiana, would one day receive an award from the NCAA named after President Ford. I am humbled and I thank God for giving me the abilities and opportunities provided by the NCAA to make my personal dream come true. Thanks to my wife Jenelle, and our family for all of their support. I would like for Jenelle to please stand. (*Applause*)

I will tell you Jenelle is a real saint for putting up with me for all these years. I remember one year she sat in the stands while I covered junior high, high school, college and pro football games, 55 times when I was on the field. That is a real devotion to sports medicine. By the way, I had an encounter with President Ford, which was a little unusual. I was playing golf in Palm Springs one time, and I was hitting down the fairway and I had one of those terrible shots I am popular for. It went over the left and over this house. I was about out of golf balls, so I said, “Well, I am going to go back here, and I believe I can find that golf ball.” Well, I went back there, and I surprised Betty Ford, who was pruning her roses, and President Ford came running out along with security, and they escorted me quickly back on the golf course. Obviously, I made the right decision not to be a professional golfer and to go into medicine. As I look back on my development as a sport physician, I see the stepping stones that God put before me to help me. The scholarship given to me by LSU for pole vaulting led me to medical school, to orthopedics, and to my subspecialty of sports medicine. The one thing I have learned, though, and it is very true, if you love what you do and you do what you love, you will be successful. One of the true joys in my career has been the privilege of being the team physician for five straight Division I National Football Championships, three with Alabama and two with Auburn. Figure that one out. Speaking of being successful and it has always been my dream to help young student-athletes remain in the sport they love and to continue to be successful in life. My advice is never to be satisfied with their success, and live their lives by self-analysis, self-criticism, and time by nature. And that means to be patient. I have not always done that. I have a sign on my operating room doors that says, “Be patient, but do it in a hurry.” I was recently asked how long I have been taking care of athletes. My answer was 40 years. To me that didn’t seem long because every day brings on a new challenge and I love every minute of it.

The other thing that is important about success is not just getting there, but maintaining success once you have achieved it. Think about that. But that is the particular history in the sports world. The other question I directly get asked is how many operations have I done? Well, the pat answer is I have finally figured that one out is as follows: "Too many to count and not enough to quit." As far as the student-athlete and the NCAA are concerned, there are many challenges ahead. Yes, for the student-athlete, set your goals and dreams high, and use your athletic ability and education as a stepping stone to a successful life. In regards to the NCAA, unfortunately, collegiate sports has become a big business. Regardless, thanks to the NCAA for always putting the student ahead of the athlete. Also, thanks to the NCAA for continuing to legislate rules and regulations that directly benefit the student-athlete, particularly, the safety factors. Lastly, thank you very much for this great honor. I am truly humbled. Thank you all very much. (*Applause*)

President Emmert: Thank you, Dr. Andrews. Congratulations again.

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

So, at this session, it has always been a tradition that the president of the Association delivers a State of the Association speech. It tends to be a little long-winded and a little boring. So, I decided that I wanted to do something quite different this year. What I want to do, since this Convention has so many major issues going on in all three of the divisions, there are so many big questions about what is happening in the NCAA. What are the core values of the NCAA, how are we going to move forward in this really challenging and exciting time? I thought it would be more advantageous for all of you to hear from all of the leaders that you have put in place to represent each of the three divisions. It provides a great opportunity for us to hear directly from each of those people. I would like to call them up now on stage to join President Simon. First of all, Dr. Nathan Hatch, the president of Wake Forest University, and is also the chair of the Division I Board of Directors. Next, Patrick O'Brien, president of West Texas A&M University and chair of the Division II President's Council. And finally, Dr. Jack Ohle, president of Gustavus Adolphus College, and chair of the D-III Board. (*Applause*)

So, what we want to do in the bit of time that we have, not an awful lot of time, but a little bit of time, is to talk about and think about some of the great big changeling intercollegiate athletics today. The Convention, this meeting is a great time for us to spend a little bit of time thinking about and reflecting on what are the core functions and what are the core values of the NCAA? What makes us distinctive and different from all the other sports-related activities that go on out there? There are plenty of sports associations, sports leagues that are there, the NFL and the NBA, and the Olympics and the whole variety of national and even international sports associations that organize games, that set up playing rules that make sure the integrity of the game is maintained, that post championships that promote and develop the games and help market them and bring a lot of value to those games. We do that and we do it very, very well. In all three of our divisions and all 89 of our championships and each of the sports that you all are involved in and that you-all oversee, and our student-athletes play. But there is one huge differentiator between what happens in the NCAA and what happens in all those other sports associations or leagues. That is, that we do it in the context of higher education, and we have to have always in front of us, foremost on our minds and notion that this is about young men and young women who come to our institutions for an education, to develop their skills athletically but also in all of their abilities to move forward in life and go out of our universities as people that have all the skills and ability to that they need as Dr. Andrews has done, in all his years to plan the health and safety that support those young people. We worry about and have to be always focused on the development of student-athletes and their success. If we are not focused on that, if that is not at the forefront of what this Association is all about, then we really don't differentiate ourselves from everyone else. That is the big differentiator. That is what makes the NCAA distinct from the rest of the athletic world, and also is what unites all three divisions, because the divisions may approach those things somewhat differently. But they all have to deal with that same question of how do we help and support our student-athletes? So, we need to at this Convention and other places routinely ask ourselves does the current model of how we support student-athletes make sense today? Are we doing everything that we can to support those athletes in their goals of success in the classroom, on the field, on the court, and as they go out and transition into life and become professionals in their

world endeavors? Are we structuring a model that they can capitalize on all the things that all your campuses provide them in terms of educational opportunities, and internships, study abroad opportunities, and all of the variety of things that we so justly pride ourselves on as academic leaders. I think graduating from our institutions with the skills and abilities to go out and be successful. Do they have time to develop those skills and are we shaping these experiences that would allow them to be successful? Are we using the very best practices, the very best signs to make sure that we have health and wellness policies in place that we know is doing everything possible with the best information that we know to benefit those student-athletes and keep them safe and successful? Are our playing rules the way we govern the games credibly the best we can or should do in 2014? All of those and similar issues, I think, are things that are on the agendas for each of the three divisions. The things that you all have come here San Diego to talk about it, and we need to turn first and foremost to our topics here on the stage and ask some of these and others. So, I would like to begin, we don't have an awful lot of time, with President Hatch. I will ask the simple question. Well, a simple question, the answer is very complicated but the question is very simple. Many of you know that Division I is re-examining its governance process and we just finished a conversation about that, and I think, in fact, it was quite successful with 800 of the members there. One of the things we heard again and again is can this change in governance allow Division I to more effectively address the needs of student-athletes, what about that change in the governance? Are you excited about it? How can it help manage the decision-making process of the membership so that the students are in the front of the agenda?

President Hatch: I think it holds that promise in several respects. First, is the focus of the Board itself. To the extent that the Board becomes Board engaged in strategic issues and focuses on the core mission purpose of the NCAA, I think it will force spending more time on student-athlete well-being. I think the Board in the past has been involved in approving things that came from other places, but as it moves beyond that, I think it will be more focused on issues such as academic standards, graduation rates, our students striving in all dimensions of their life and being prepared academically and socially for the professions after they leave college. What is their success five years out? We are willing to ask that. Are we mitigating sports injuries? Those kind of issues, I think the Board will be more addressing.

Secondly, I think the new plan will call for new engagement by athletic directors, and I think that will better surface issues related to student-athletes and provide swifter and more appropriate responses to the challenges they face.

The third area is that hopefully with the new structure will enhance communication. Communication to the members, to the conferences, to individual institutions, and similarly that will be a way to better focus on the student-athlete's needs.

Finally, with respect to the well-resourced conferences and the latitude that they are seeking has to do with being able to spend more money on behalf of the student-athletes. That is things like full cost of attendance or other forms of educational assistance. I think that is an additional way which will be very pro student in its orientation.

President Emmert: Pat, Division II has a somewhat different governance structure as does Division III. I have sat in many of your meetings where you two focus on what is going on in the lives of these student-athletes. Do you have any thoughts or advice for your colleagues over in Division I about how they can craft their governance structure to help them stay focused on the student's success and what lessons there might be from D-II in that regard?

Mr. O'Brien: Thank you, Mark. Do you want to listen to me? In my opinion, there are several aspects of the governance structure that we need to talk about that support well the educational experience and development of our student-athletes. I will talk about two of them. Background in 2005–2006, there was, I think, both action taken on the part of the presidents and chancellors of Division II. They wanted to have a clearly articulated statement of what D-II was all about. In the first paragraph of the strategic positioning platform, which is our guiding principles, it is stated that the educational experience of student-athletes is paramount: Students

come first. I can tell you in all the discussions that I have been in, in the President's Council and the Management Council, when we have been talking about changing processes, our legislative actions, we always go back to that statement: Educational experience of student-athletes is paramount.

The second aspect of the governance structure of D-II that I think works extremely well for us, is that we have a very, very strong National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. It is very strong. It is comprised of a group of incredibly talented and dedicated students. With these students we engage in the legislative process of Division II. We engage them in the concept stage of legislative proposals, all the way to providing them a voice on the floor in our Business Session at which we take votes on that legislation. Now, they don't operate in a vacuum, they solicit input from conference SAACs and from institutional SAACs. In July, we have a joint meeting of the Management Council and the student-athletes. This morning we had a joint breakfast, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and the Management Council, the Presidents Council. We tried to have a dialogue and the students are the voice of the customer. They constantly remind us, as does that strategic positioning platform, what is most important, and that is the educational development of our students. Now, what doesn't work well is if we exclude anyone of our stakeholders from being a part of the governance structure. That doesn't work well at all. We have got to make sure that we have input: The presidents, the chancellors, the student-athletes, the commissioners, the ADs, coaches, and athletic administrators. We have got to bring all the voices to the table. Now, in my opinion, if we need to change something, if we need to enhance the opportunity for the coaches in Division II to have a greater say. (*Applause*)

President Emmert: Pat, let me stay with that for a time of Division II for a minute, because in Division II, you and your colleagues have I think justifiably and understandably are proud of the notion of life in the balance, and you have passed a handful of reviews, have passed some reform agenda items, that you tried to limit some of the time commitments that the student-athletes have and constraints on the schedules so it provides more opportunities, just in the calendar year, for student-athletes. At the same time, of course, I know that Division II is also talking about, well, maybe we should allow our coaches to have access to athletes in the summer time, or strength and conditioning, and some of that starts to sound like, well, maybe you are creeping a little bit away from some of that commitment and maybe that starts to just look a lot what we see in Division I. As a leader in Division II, and with your colleagues on the Management Council and fellow presidents, how do you strike that balance? Everybody wants to win, everyone wants to be competitive, and everyone wants your athletes to be ready to play more, but on the other hand we were talking earlier about the need for them to have time to do all the other things that will develop these young men and women. What advice do you have for everybody on that issue?

Mr. O'Brien: That is a great observation to the full time student-athlete year around. You asked some excellent questions associated with that. In D-II, we are very, very proud of the progress that we have made in life and balance. We think through the life and balance initiative that we passed in 2010 and 2011, and we are able to provide greater opportunity for our student-athletes to take advantage of the full college experience. On the other hand, I think we have got to continue exploring ways in which we can provide greater opportunities. I think we also have got to be continually and diligently that we don't fall back, slide back and repeat the old ways. You talk about trade-offs. With regard to athletics, I think there are a set of trade-offs that we potentially have to be concerned about: trade off academics, athletics; campus engagement, athletics; community engagements, athletics. Now, when I think about those potential trade-offs, I work with three premises. First, the primary purpose for our existence as institutions of higher education is to educate, cultivate, and graduate women and men so that they can thrive in their careers and in their lives. That's fair enough. That is the first premise. The second premise is that not all learning that takes place on our campus, takes place in the classroom. If we appropriately handle intercollegiate athletics, it is an extension of the learning process of what we do in the classroom. Students can learn soft skills. Those skills that are necessary for them to thrive. We can do the same thing with campus engagement. Students participate in student organizations and student governance, where with the community engagement, service time. I then go to my third premise. Anything done in excess has powerful impacts. So, we can concentrate too much on any problem aspect of trade-offs. We found ourselves in 2010 -- well, we started in 2008, we came to the position that had we reached that point of excess with athletics, and that's the reason why

we came up with the life and balance initiatives in which we changed the start date for students to come back for practice in the fall, in which we shortened the playing season in which we increased the number of competitions. I thought all of this was designed to give students more time so that they could experience that full college experience. But, to be honest, I think that is the easy part. That's the easy part. How do we accommodate the students that want to engage in a study abroad program, a semester exchange program, an internship, a co-op? What about that student that wants to take off four years to study in China? How do we handle that? Here is the really tough ones for me, Mark. I hear from some students that their dream is to assume a career in nursing, or major in pre-med, or become an engineer, but they are being discouraged from doing so because in either one of those you have lab courses, and those lab courses are generally in the afternoon and that is when the coaches want to practice. I don't think you can legislate that away. I think the solution from that has to come from the top, from the message that we as chancellors and presidents give throughout our campus, through our ADs, our coaches, our administrators. That message is simple: The primary purpose for our existence as institutions of higher education is to educate, cultivate and graduate women and men so that they can thrive in their lives and in their careers. If it means to accommodate a student that wants to pursue nursing and taken biology lab courses in the afternoon or chemistry lab courses in the afternoon, change the practice time. It is simple. We allow our students to utilize their four years of eligibility in 10 semesters, allows a student to go study for a year in China, if that is their passion. And they will come back and they will be just as good when they left because they probably worked out well there. We have got to be more accommodating, for that has got to be the message that we as presidents and chancellors give to our campuses.

President Emmert: Thank you. So, Jack, in Division III, you have significant pressures. You are not pushed to play a football game on a Tuesday night by ESPN, right?

Mr. Ohle: Right.

President Emmert: On the other hand, you have, for example, a really interesting time pressure that is different than the other two divisions. You are now debating whether or not you ought to have recruiting seasons for coaches because today you don't have one. The other two divisions do have them, and you have got coaches that are saying, "My goodness, I've got 12 months out the year and it is almost an inverse sort of pressure in some way, and you are debating that. How are you trying to address those in Division III right now? What do you think that conversation is going to look like here and into the future?"

Mr. Ohle: Actually, Mark, I think that conversation is very exciting. Pat, you can change practice times and get students to participate in labs and do those things. As I sit here, I think the three Divisions have more in common than they have differences. Certainly, there are opportunities for the athletes in the other two divisions that we can't provide in Division III. We have fairly restricted rules. Our playing seasons, our contests are limited, and out-of-season contact is very difficult. Coaches can't meet with the students and they can't participate with them as athletes because they are members of the Student Council or singing the choir, or doing things that are important to their life as a student. Most of those restrictions that we place on Division III came in 2004, and we need to assure that student-athletes have as much time as possible to pursue those non-athletic type interests. Our D-III member's survey and the SAAC group keep telling us we are on the right track. So, from our standpoint, we are thinking about how we can address the concerns of the coach, how we can address the concerns of the athlete? Our challenge is to communicate the benefits of athletics to our students, to prospective students, to get them to thinking of coming to college, to continue an opportunity to play, to be part of the team. Often parents today, unfortunately, believe more equals better. I am afraid of the youth culture. We face that, every division faces that. Some believe that athletics scholarships are more important than academic scholarships. D-III has about 25 to 30 percent on the average participation for our students in athletic programs. Some schools go up as far as 50 percent. With current enrollment and financial challenges facing private and public institutions, we must address the tough questions. D-III is discussing many of those questions here this weekend. How do we recruit, Mark, as you asked more technically more efficiently the athletic models to serve the educational mission steps that of the academy, not dictate the initiative. We must keep athletics in perspective, and that's how we are dealing with it in

Division III.

President Emmert: Let me shift gears a little bit, Jack, and again talk about why institutions play these games and why they are willing to make financial investments, and you have very modest revenue streams. There is a complete misunderstanding about money in college sports. People think all universities and colleges are rolling in money because they play sports, and we know that the exact opposite is true. The universities and colleges make decisions to play sports to benefit student-athletes, but also to benefit the institution, and it is a great way to build social glue that holds the community together. It is a great way to recruit students who may or may not be athletes. It is a great way to build an alumni support that may become donors and political support, and we all recognize that. The Division III schools might say we are going to start our football program because we want to attract more male students, or whatever the model. It becomes an enrollment advantaging tool. When, a university and an institution or colleges is getting institutional benefit from those sports, what concomitant responsibility do they have to make an investment, not just in fielding a team, but in fielding a team that has got all the health and safety issues taken care of, have got all the right support structures in place, have got all the academics support issues resolved, and all the other things that will allow students to be successful. So, that it is more than can we afford uniforms and our coach's bus? Can we also afford all those things that allow our students to be successful? How do we strike a balance on all of that?

Mr. Ohle: That balance is very difficult. We struggle with it at all of our Division III institutions. There is no doubt about it. We have limitations, but my joy is sitting with an athlete who has come to Gustavus Adolphus to play football, or a woman athlete to play volleyball and to hear her excitement about continuing her sport and then thinking about how we can do those things that are necessary for that man or woman to have the best education. Then fast forward two or three years and all of a sudden you find out that student is not participating in that sport, and is still at Gustavus because we recruited them as students to play athletics. For us, that is easy because we don't have the athletic scholarship. It is a little bit different there. But what we are trying to do is to think how we can model a unique way for students to participate without athletic aid. Now, every president out here and everyone that works with a D-III institution will tell you that our students receive as much aid as most athletes at other divisions. But it is done differently. It is done with a model that enables us to do academics, to do need-based aid, and to provide for our students the resources that are necessary. As I commented earlier, the important thing is that we must understand that we are not there just to participate in athletics, we must guard against the playing season being extended and the contests being extended, and the out-of-season participation. Right now, we are dealing with a helmet issue. Our football coaches want to have the students to have a helmet on when they have their exercises in the spring. They are allowed to do that, but they don't have any equipment. The presidents have dealt with that very directly. You know, that takes it a step too far. That is not what we are trying to accomplish. Looking at that Association-wide thing for D-III, we have 450 institutions, and they are all different. We have 45 voting conferences, and we have 175 powerful athletes. It is my hope that we can be an example in looking at how we recruit those student-athletes that understand the model of the unique opportunity to participate. We must also give student-athletes the time to pursue education. Pat, I think you were right on target. How do they study away, how do they get engaged? They are making a huge investment in their education to come to a D-III institution, and it's our responsibility to have return on that investment. D-III's top priority is academic success naturally. I think every Division I says that. We must hire and support coaches and administrators who support the D-III philosophy, we are not in competition. As much as people say, well, you know, that student will go to a D-II school, that student may say they will go to a D-I school and play his third, fourth or fifth year. We are trying to find a way that the students can answer the question and encourage them to really be on campus, in active ways, that you say with community activities and all of the study programs that they have, community service. It is critical to listen in order to involve and trust our students in the SAAC. Many of our Division III SAAC members are here. They are vital to where we are. You said that, Pat. I think D-III is the only division that actually has members of the SAAC serve on the Management Council and vote. I would suggest that is something that we all ought to consider. You said it and we all have said it. The importance of the voice of the student is extremely important. When we listen to athletes, we learn. Again, with so many D-III schools being tu-

ition dependent and having a high percentage of students participating in athletics, all of this is fundamental to our collective success. This is the D-III philosophy. We don't feel we are any better than D-II or D-I. In fact, I think we have more in common, let's say. This is an exciting time for the NCAA. And, Mark, I applaud the direction that you are taking with giving us a chance to think of the student-athlete and how we do that. As we have talked in the Executive Committee meetings, really providing opportunities for a very large part of our student-athletes, not just one or two percent.

President Emmert: Nathan, I am going to ask Lou Anna this question also. The financial issues that allow resources to be available to support student-athletes are obviously different at Division I in many respects. One of the conversations that we have been hearing during the D-I Dialogue and the debate about governance structure has been that if schools have greater resources we can support some student-athletes with greater resources and create some competitive advantage. You want to make sure you have got something approaching competitive fairness across schools, but on the other hand, you don't want to hold people back in supporting students in their level of success. That is going to be one of the debates that is reining right now in Division I Governance. How do we strike a balance on that? I would love to have Lou Anna to weigh in on this one too. What do you hope that D-I members will be looking at and keep their focus on as they work their way through that? It is a pretty non-question.

Mr. Hatch: I think that whatever our financial D-I situation is, and that obviously varies greatly in Division I. We must keep our focus not only on success in the athletic field but on educating the whole person. We cannot skip on the academic demands, academic support, on investing in social and professional skills. Working to build a culture for graduation is a prize first and expected is the point. Well, when it comes to regular resources, conferences, I mean, the challenges are greater. I would say in many fields excellence does not require balance; it does not. So, athletes come to our institution so they can be the best at what they want to do. In some ways that cannot be a purely balanced life. They want to be the very best, and at the same time it means that those institutions must make sure that athletics is not all that they have, that we are deeply engaged and involved in the business of education. I would say one thing. I would use the scripture phrase that John Kennedy used often and Bill Gates, and that is if too much is given, much is expected. I think as the larger conferences, if they provide more support to student-athletes, they should hold themselves to a higher mark. We should be graduating students better. We should be willing to look five years out to see what they are doing to make sure that that support is not just another enticement included, but it really is substantive help for the long term well-being of these students.

President Emmert: Lou Anna, what do you think about that same issue?

Ms. Simon: I would add to that. I think they have a responsibility, the people need, if they believe that athletics is one of those tangible and intangible parts that is part of our educational responsibility to have broad-based programs as our resources grow, to be able to accommodate as many student-athletes as possible in sports that may not be as high profile as the ones that are defined by the high resource conferences. That is part of our educational responsibility. As Pat and Jack have talked about, the rules of athletics in the terms of the collegiate model, I would also say as an institution that may not see itself as always having the largest resources, we compete with one another academically without worrying so much about whether we are leveling the playing field to the rules. I have to compete with the same faculty for NAIH grants, and I don't get a different set of rules from some institution that may have a much larger academic health center that I do. So, there is a little bit of this equality component and competition, and it is not about the rest of our academic experiences. I think we need to set that aside and think about that a little bit differently in this resource constraint world that we all are in.

President Emmert: I want to shift gears completely now, and get back to something we were talking about a minute ago around, really, the demands on the student's time, if I could. I think maybe you said very nicely, that balance is hard to describe when someone is trying to achieve excellence. It doesn't matter whether physics or football. Whatever they want to be good in, they are devoting a lot of time in, but we also aspire to make sure the student-athletes when they go out in the world are successful in their profession. They can get a

job. We know that less than one percent of our total students go out and become professional athletes. As the ad says, "Go pro in something other than sports," and we want to make sure they are ready, willing and able to do that. That means that as several of you said, we have got to find more creative ways of allowing them to use their time. I have heard recently some interesting notions about how to do that. As part of the D-I Governance debate, can we establish big blocks of time where we just mandate that the students have no sports contact, and there is some chunk of time there is a dead period? Can we think about the notion, especially in Division I, where we know student-athletes in some sports are putting in 30 to 40 hours a week, and that is a full-time commitment. If they were working full-time in a job we would probably expect them to graduate in six years instead of four or five. Can we say okay, this is a six-year commitment instead of a four or five year commitment, so they can say I get another year to do by study abroad or my internship, or whatever I want to do? Can we think of it in terms of scholarships that are commitments for a time period of four or five years, but there are commitments for a bachelor's degree, however long that takes, and I am going to try to play professional ball in Europe and then come back to Michigan State and finish up and do my internship and become a CPA or whatever it is? How flexible do you think the membership can or should be in thinking about all three divisions how you can create more time? There are no more hours in the day. You can't create more hours. Can you create more days by saying, "Look, this is a longer term commitment," or does that make any sense?

Mr. Hatch: I think we need to be as creative as possible on behalf of our student-athletes. I do remember at one time that Notre Dame had a varsity basketball player who wanted to go to London for the summer program, and so we installed a squash court regulation basketball court so we could shoot free throws. I do think one does have say how can these athletes be sometimes safe from yourselves?

President Emmert: You guys don't want to hear what I have to say.

Mr. Hatch: I think their coaches will spend as much possible time as they can, and also the coaches need to be safe to themselves, and in the ACC basketball coaches say please limit our recruiting season because if you don't, we will do it nonstop. I do think we need to be creative in giving some coaches and students some break from the intensity of that kind of competition.

President Emmert: Now, it seems to be growing not shrinking. I have not heard anybody voluntarily backing down. You have done some at D-II but not voluntarily. I am saying you had to impose it. Coaches and athletes wouldn't voluntarily do it, and say I don't want you to impose it. Lou Anna, how do you think how flexible should the membership think about this issue?

Ms. Simon: I think it is critical for us to be creative and our colleagues outlying the strategies to do that. I like the idea that I can come and go with more flexibility. We have raised private dollars to bring people back so they can get their degrees. We think it is really so important for them to do that. It is key for the institution to be able to support that. I think also I see in our own students in other fields the pressure of jobs, the pressure of getting everything out of their experience, and we are having to drag some students outside of the multimedia labs that are doing films 24 hours a day, and they see that as the way they are going to make their mark. It does take folks saying wait, there is more to this than that narrow experience. We need you to lead Michigan State and our institutions have experienced full range of what we can offer you today and tomorrow.

President Emmert: Jack.

Mr. Ohle: I as sit here, Mark, I am thinking, my colleagues are hitting it right on the head with many of their comments, and how it affects their division. Division III is a little bit different situation in that, you know, we are dependent totally on external support, and we don't pay our athletes scholarships. However, our athletes are participating in very high levels doing wonderful things, and we are talking to them about the return on their investment. I mentioned that earlier. We are starting to talk in many of our schools in D-III about the return on their education. I think that D-I can do that, I think D-II can do that. We are providing an education for young men and women that gives them a lifetime of success, not just sports success. There are one or two percent that are

going to be looking toward that. But the beauty of what we offer, and you said it earlier in your opening comments, is that we have an opportunity to provide an education for students to learn inside and outside the classroom, in the sports arena, and our students are going away after graduation and not going after that first high paying job because they know if they have the education they can get that next paying job. The second or third job down the road. Those are the kinds of things I think we all have to look at and help educate our students.

President Emmert: So, my segue and this will probably have to be the last question, and I will throw you, Lou Anna, the softball. The pay-for-play. So, everyone these days are talking about pay-for-play. There is a huge debate about what does that really mean? For some people that is turning student-athletes into fully employed, unionized members of a professional class, and others that are providing a full stipend and earning in between. Tell us what you think about this whole issue. If you are actually fast, it is time for me to put Nathan on the hot seat, too.

Ms. Simon: We have a countdown clock for those of you that will give me three and a half minutes to answer this question in the way that is comprehensive. I have already used about 20 seconds of that in the process. We are an institution that believes in cross subsidy. We have academic programs that are more or less higher performing in terms of their revenue stream. We have academic programs that are lower in performing in their academic revenue. We believe in cross subsidy in athletics. Almost all of us in the room use institutional funds, not profits from athletic events, to pick to pay really for the opportunities we are providing to our athletes, because we believe those opportunities are really important. Interestingly, though, I was with a corporate set of folks, and they were talking about their corporations. They have divisions that are profitable and they have divisions that are not very profitable. If you think about the auto companies in Michigan, you could use some examples of that. They don't necessarily believe they need to compensate their workforce, their talent pool differently in a profitable division and an unprofitable division. We essentially provide the same benefits, tangible and intangible, to student-athletes who are in areas that are generating revenue and in areas that are not necessarily generating revenue. I am in a conference that shares revenue equally without regard to who generated it. If you believe so passionately that this enterprise called intercollegiate athletics is valuable collectively to us as an institution, but more important to the student-athletes who participate, and keep that foremost. I would say that I see myself as president of 99 percent of the student-athletes, not the one percent. There are many stories written about the one percent who think that they gain more from participating in sports from than their education. I think personally they should go off and do that, and we should not be constrained by others outside of the collegiate model for those who will be able to go off and pursue their dreams as they would choose, anytime they would choose it.

President Emmert: Thank you. What about you, Nathan?

Mr. Hatch: I think there are many other consequences of paying college athletes. In general, I am opposed to it. I think one of the issues is generally what sports writer talk about. They talk about paying people in the money sports. Obviously, our institutions tend to treat scholarships across the board. So, I think it could have very damaging effects on our sports, particularly women's sports. If, in fact, a substantial part of the revenues are going to football and basketball. I think it gives the wrong incentive why someone should be a student-athlete. In some ways, I wish there were more opportunities for someone who just wanted to be an athlete, like there are in baseball, and just go to that and not necessarily use college as a farm team for professional aspirations. I think one has to be very careful. Another issue in our free market economy, it is the case that generally the star athletic gets paid more. I think that is the kind of direction this would go, in fact, if we paid athletes. So, we would be recruiting athletes and potentially pay substantial amounts against the odds.

President Emmert: Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in thanking the participants. *(Applause)*

CLOSE OF BUSINESS

Executive Chairperson Simon: Thanks again, Mark, on behalf of the Association, for your leader-

ship and your commitment to academic athletics and personal success for our student-athletes. This is an interesting format. I hoped others enjoyed it as much as we did. Thank you for your leadership. (*Applause*)

I should note the highlights of this session will be available on ncaa.org immediately following this session. The delegates' reception will take place in the pool area of the Marriott. Thank you all for attending this year's NCAA Convention. As you exit the session we invite you to continue our celebration of student-athletes as reflected in the video Championship. This session is officially adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was duly adjourned at 6:45 o'clock p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS
of the
NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION I FORUM GOVERNANCE DIALOGUE

Friday, January 17, 2014
MARRIOTT MARQUIS & MARINA
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

JANUARY 17, 2014

(The Division I Forum of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held on Friday, January 17, 2014, in the Marriott Marquis & Marina, San Diego, California, was called to order at 8:00 o'clock a.m., with Moderator Jean Frankel presiding.)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome back Nathan Hatch.

MR. HATCH: Morning, everyone. Thank you for being here again to discuss governance redesign of Division I. On behalf of the Steering Committee let me thank you very much for your substantive interaction yesterday. This is very helpful to kind of key questions you raise. It will be very instructive as the Committee moves forward. Our interaction continues, we got about 600 E-mails last night and that website will remain open for the next 30 days and so we encourage individual responses on that. As you can see our work today is anything but fixed and it's pretty high level. So the exact model has yet to be crafted and we look forward today to substantive reaction on it as we try to clarify what's best for Division I. We turn things over again to Jean Frankel.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Good morning. Thank you. Morning, everyone. I want you to know I was up till midnight reading some of those 600 E-mails and actually tried to respond to a few so some of you may have gotten those responses and I will echo Dr. Hatch's comment, we're just thrilled with your feedback and we want to keep this dialogue going so that really important. We have some important work to do this morning, and one of the things I can promise you is that we will be using these polling units for questions that are even more substantial than what is your favorite household pet. How's that? So the work for today is to get into in-depth the model and the choices that are out there and to get your input, not just know what would modify it, how you would adjust it, what kinds of things you think are missing and how you think we should proceed moving forward. So when we talk about our process for this morning I'm going to very, very briefly, very briefly, step you through the full model, just to kind of refresh your memories although I'm sure you all stayed up all night thinking the model, right? You all have it memorized, right? I want to kind of see what you're thinking a little bit, then I'm going to ask you to sort of get started in a process where I'm going to take each of these four pieces, remember these four pieces, and you're going to literally add and modify what you would change about this model. In between your small and full group conversations we're going to have a few polls and we're going to ask some provocative questions to ask you to think about about some of the major elements in this model on all four of these domains including legislative structure. So it's going to be an action-packed morning, we hope, with building on the dialogue we had yesterday. We had some real substantive conversation. Already people are rolling up their sleeves. So very, very briefly I just want to call your attention to what the model is like, then I'm going to turn you loose and give you a little help along the way. So by the way, go back one slide, I will tell you why there are dotted lines where there are, sub-council. Right now the Committee on Academic Performance reports directly to the Board and so there's some question about where a potential sub-council for academic issues might report, whether it continues to report to the Board or whether it might report to the Council because the Council in this model sort of takes over more the day-to-day legislative stuff, so you know, we did a lot in a short amount of time. The reason why those dotted lines are there is because we even as a Steering Committee weren't

quite sure where we wanted to put that so that's the mystery of the dotted lines. So the governing principles, you know, one of the things that's important to know is this is where they started and they took those core values we talked about yesterday and they built these principles around which had the litmus test for everything they did. So, by the way, should there be any questions, student-athlete and student-athlete well being is first, and that was first and foremost and it was so present in our minds that maybe sometimes we didn't actually say it but it was absolutely front and center on lines of support. Collegiate model; higher education focus, it's basically taking the values and putting them into more sort of operational focus. By the way, many of you made a lot of comments about the core values discussion. I was actually very pleased yesterday with a very rich discussion. You made some very good points about how we kind of got a mix of beliefs, values, principles, strategies and we need to maybe revisit that as a Division, and so that message has been heard and I think that's really important moving forward. So, again, these are principles that sort of help guide the opportunity to be engaged, so let's talk about the Board. Any Steering Committee members interrupt me if you have things to share along the way as well. There was a very important conversation about the role of the Board. I'll tell you that the way this really went we started talking about structure and we said, Okay, how much should we have. Where should they come from. I stopped and said, Okay, let's talk first about what Division 1 actually needs a Board to do. Actually talked about role, so we had a long and robust conversation about oversight versus sort of the the roll up your sleeves legislative approach that they had been playing the last couple of years. So we came up with these four areas as places for oversight and for attention of the Board, so we talked about what the Board agendas might look like in this kind of dialogue and the idea of putting strategic issues, issues that are bigger, around the key challenges when they are employed to athletics. If this Board doesn't talk about it where is it going to happen? It needs to happen somewhere. We talked about policy. We talked about a legislative role this Board might play, whether there might be an override process or not, and the Steering Committee really, really wants to look at the override process as an exception rather than a role and doesn't want to get involved in a lot of day-to-day things but instead wants to be sort of an overall oversight. Anyone want to say anything about that oversight role as we go forward, any of you Steering Committee folks, oversight conversation, Harris?

MR. PASTIDES: With respect to management only, I view that role to be very light. In fact, I'm not sure I like the terminology anymore that we're to determine how the association can serve membership. I think it's a very light monitoring role maybe to help ensure that the association is serving the membership correctly. We do not have time to get involved. We're not co-managers, just have a light, light hand on it to make sure that CEO and staff are doing a good job.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Any other comments about oversight? So that was one very important piece of this model. So then we looked at size and composition and this is the absolute truth. We looked at the current model that we have today. We did a lot in a very short amount of time and we, quite honestly, ran out of time to have a lot of in-depth conversation about changing that model. That is a very important piece that this group is looking for your feedback on today. You know, what would be the advisability of staying with the current model. What is advisability of going with a smaller Board perhaps. What would be the advisability of adding various voices to the process, whether they be outside or inside, so that was a really important piece of conversation. Part of the dynamic here was that this Council underneath is going to be a group of practitioners and folks that are at a senior level, really focused on building a good legislative structure. The idea would be that the Council Chair might be an AD or would be on the Board so the idea was perhaps that the constituents might not be on the Board but might be on this very important high-level council. That's just our working thought. Anyone want to make any comments on that? Sound good? The nominations process. This is a really important concept that I heard some energy around both in your conversations yesterday and in the E-mails that you sent as well. It's a very different way of looking at things but it's also something that many organizations both for profit, not for profit use a very focused nominations process, Nominations Committee, we call sort of competency based. That doesn't mean by the way these people aren't competent, right, but it means rather than simply looking at representations we're looking at the kind of things that a Board or particular lobby needs, and this competency-based model would happen not only at the Board but the Council level to make sure that we populate those groups with

folks with actual expertise that's needed and also to bring the best and most focused and most important expertise from the membership as possible. So this is an important dynamic of the nominations process for the Board and Council. Voting structure, so still to be determined. We didn't talk a lot about this. The Board currently does not have a way of voting other than the seats, right, that you are slotted in so still an open conversation about that. We didn't talk a lot about overrides but that's going to be an important thing to talk about as well. Let's talk about Standing Committees. This is a little different thing. Nathan had some comments he prepared originally, he said this yesterday, we can't work as a committee as a whole. You want to say a few things about that?

MR. HATCH: I think most of us who are involved in university Boards or other Boards find that actually much of the work is done in committees with focus in specific areas, and so I do think there's been a weakness of the Board because everything comes to the Committee as a whole, so we take the objection yesterday, we have to be careful that those committees aren't doing the same thing that the Council or other groups are doing. But I do think the idea of the committee structure is a useful one.

MR. DRAKE: I just have a comment from a moment ago. We were looking at kind of Board structure, we say things like 17. No one here thinks that 17 means anything in particular except about 17, so I mean it could be a little few more or fewer, whatever. It really isn't more than to be put together in a structure so that it would function appropriately for the work and not have rigid parameters that would be defined.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So let's talk about these Standing Committees. In word process and many organizations you have a role you call a Board liaison, so that Board member would have the responsibility to liaison with a particular committee, you know, that's doing some kind of work in the organization. So these Standing Committees are not really at the Board level designed to do a lot of work but to liaison with other groups within the substructure. One of the other ideas that the Steering Committee has is that those Standing Committees would be populated not just with presidents with but with other practitioners, sort of bringing them up into the system, and the idea might be that maybe they wouldn't be officially on the Board with the the slotted seats but they would be serving on Board committees so that would help bring them up into that structure. So that's an idea and it is not the idea that we can duplicate any work groups that are in the Council level but, in fact, more of a liaison role. So improving communications. Communication is a key thing that we heard in the listening posts last year, trying to make sure that the membership understands the intent of the Board and the Board understands the intent of the membership. I think everyone agreed that communications mechanisms need to be improved and engaged. We talked about where some of those areas might be. We also talked in the model that the Board might want to have some ad hoc kinds of groups and that is also something that's in best practice in many organizations where the Board will appoint a particular group with expertise to work on a focused issue versus a specific amount of time, right? It's not designed to be a Standing Committee that works forever and ever and so the purpose of that is to, again, bring expertise from the membership to focus on something when we want something, so that was something we worked on as well. So the PAG is in this. Does everyone know what the PAG is? So the PAG is in this model and actually in the PAG the other day we had some interesting conversation about this. Rita, you want to say anything about this?

MS. CHENG: We did. There definitely is a lot of conversation within the PAG and over the years in the Board about overall representation and the structure of including that box in our strawman was to recognize that we do need to have an opportunity for presidents who might not be sitting on the Board in a particular year or term to have a voice and so that box is to symbolize, however we structure that, that there has to be a mechanism for other presidents to interact and engage in high-level visioning, agenda setting and work with the Board.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So there was an interesting -- also another interesting provocative idea in that very conversation. One of the interesting provocative ideas was maybe the PAG is not a 22 member

but a 32 member and maybe it actually serves as sort of an Advisory Council in the way that I believe Divisions II and III have that as well, so, you know, maybe that's a whole other idea as well to try to bring and conversation at all levels. So that's a governing body so, again, all ideas are welcome and out there to readjust that as you see fit. So the Council, so some people say we're going back to the Management Council. Well, I don't know that that's necessarily the dynamic. The dynamic is that if the Board decides it wants to take this oversight role, right, it wants to be able to have a robust substructure that really focuses on legislative kinds of issues, so this council, a bit undeveloped but some thinking here around composition, representation from all conversations, might include some additional large seats so, you know, so who knows, maybe retired presidents or asset folks, lots of folks, ideas to bring their expertise into the system. Again, here is where the nominations competency-based approach comes into play and that would be an important dynamic of that. So the council is seen as having the primary responsibility for legislative matters and really sort of bringing that day-to-day legislative system back into the substructure rather than into the Board process. Can you go back one slide? Anything else that you all want to say about the council? So let's talk about legislative structure. Does anybody in the room want to talk about legislative structure? I'm hearing a deafening silence. There wasn't any silence in the 600 E-mails, folks. This is going to be an important part of our conversation today. Back to the proposed legislative structure. Council will have three formal substructures, okay. So just like we created principles for the model as a whole, we created principles for the legislative structure. So one thing you heard yesterday, and I think we heard in a lot of our conversations, is that there's a desire to maintain the current membership under something under called a Big Tent so that was our first operating dynamic. Then there was some conversation about something that we're calling legislative autonomy and what that looks like, so there was some conversation about how those decisions might be made by those five conferences. There was conversation about how input from all of Division 1 might happen in that process and there was conversation around the areas of autonomy. Now, there was another dynamic in shared governance and what that looks like and the areas of focus for each of those. So these legislative structured principles, and we heard some of these in conversations yesterday, simplified structure, another thing sort of the 2011 retreat the cycle was interrupted, and so we don't know when and how to connect the process. One of the other things that's important to your work this morning, as you look at all of these bodies, think about where and how the membership will connect into each of the bodies, where you provide input, so that's a really important piece there. So legislative autonomy, the definition of that, and legislative areas for autonomy and these are all, again, dialogues that the Steering Committee is having. Anyone want to say anything about any of these areas?

MR. DRAKE: I think this came up in the PAG a couple days ago. This is true for most of what we're hearing. As we look at the proposed areas for autonomy there's not agreement on this. These are proposed -- I would say proposed rather than suggested even, and a couple things I think require quite a bit of discussion.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So again we're looking for your feedback on both the concept of legislative autonomy and the areas. We're looking for your feedback on what the dynamics of that might be. We've got the dynamic of shared governance, so shared governance from a definitional standpoint are issues that the whole Division is looking at and focused on and so some examples at this point that were suggested might be these kinds of areas, revenue distribution, scholarships, minimum academic standards. So there's been a lot of conversation about percentages and weighted voting and all those kinds of things, so the Committee has had some discussions preliminarily. No decisions have been made, no even formal opinions have been formed. So that's a really important part of what we'd like some input today on from the membership and, in fact, we're going to do some polling on very shortly to get your idea, not only in your small groups but to get a sense in the room about where the Division really stands on some of these important issues. Proposed process for decision making in shared governance. We didn't really talk about the overriding threshold, per se. That's another place I would think would be important to get your feedback. Presidents, what have I left out in terms of our dynamic in building this model, anything? Okay. So now this goes to all of you. It's time for you to roll up your sleeves, so roll up your sleeves everybody. Okay, so we're going to take about the next 30 minutes or so and I'm going to ask you in your tables to literally start working through each of these four pieces. So this is where scribing is going to be im-

portant. You may or may not want to do some of this electronically. There are pieces of paper on your tables. You can feel free to not only give us textural content but draw pictures. If we were able to put flip charts in this room so you could actually visually draw something that would be interesting but for 850 people I don't think would be possible. Make all use of your thinking there. So for each of the four models, you know, what are the Board's governing principles, what would you change. What is missing. What other good ideas do you have in this area that we haven't thought about on and, again, send your table any input to the web address. So I'm going to give you about 30 minutes and I'm going to ask you to try to get through all four pieces of this, so I'm going to ask you to manage your time a little bit. That's a little less than 10 minutes for each of these areas and we'll continue to have that conversation. After that we'll then have some poll group discussion and have some polling as well, so your task for the next 30 minutes is to go through all four of these, right, and talk about what would you change, what's missing, what good ideas do you have and what would it look like when it's done? Are you ready to take on this challenge? I don't hear you. All right, ready, set, redesign.

(A BRIEF BREAK WAS TAKEN AT THIS TIME.)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Folks, are you ready to vote on this question? There should be AD voting representation on the Board. Give you about 20 seconds, grab your clickers, I want to see a voting poll here. Should be AD voting representation on the Board. The results are, wow, 61 percent strongly support AD voting representation on the Board. Excellent. Thank you. Okay, please continue with your conversation, please continue. It should be moving to governing body.

(A BRIEF BREAK WAS TAKEN AT THIS TIME.)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Folks, ready for the polling? Here's another polling question. Student-athletes should have representation -- voting representation on the Board. Should have voting representation, I'm sorry, on the Council. All right. Couple minutes. Give you about a minute to talk about this, then we'll do a 15-second vote. Student athletes should have voting representation on the Council, so you should be moving to substructure; right? Okay, ready to vote on this one? Ready to vote on this one? Students should have voting representation on the council. Talking about the substructure, talking about the group that would have primary responsibility for legislation. Get ready for a 15-second countdown. Answer is 38 percent strongly support, 29 support, 13 neutral, 14 oppose, 6 percent strongly oppose, okay, very good, thank you. Keep continuing and you should be moving from -- you should be talking about substructure council now moving to legislative structure. We're going to ask a few questions about the legislative structure in a few minutes. Thank you.

(A BRIEF BREAK WAS TAKEN AT THIS TIME.)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Folks, another polling question. And you should be moving through all four elements. You should be talking about principles, governing body, substructure, moving to legislative structure. And the question for you right now on distinguished independent representation on the Board. So this could be someone who is not a paying member, right, someone from the public in some sort to provide some extra perspective on PR, public issues. Take a second, think about that and we'll start the voting in about 30 seconds. In addition to, in addition to others. Okay, are you ready to vote on this independent representation on the Board. You have a 15-second countdown. Wow. Look at this. Are you all looking at these results? There should be distinguished independent representation on the Board, 40 percent strongly oppose, very interesting. Very interesting. Okay. So, folks, let me interrupt you for a minute. How much more time do you need to go through all four elements in the model? Five minutes, 10 minutes? Are you done? Give me some sense, folks. What's next, are you ready for what's next? Five minutes, 10 minutes, all right. I'm going to give you about 10 more minutes and then we're going to take a quick break and let's say we're going to come back at 9:20 and you're going to have your questions and thoughts ready for the Steering Committee. We're going to talk

about each of all four of those at about 9:20, so go as long as you need and then take a break. 9:20 we'll reconvene and visit your comments for the Steering Committee on all the model next.

(A BRIEF BREAK WAS TAKEN AT THIS TIME.)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Folks, it is time to reconvene. Discussion is going to start now. Time to reconvene. Please find your seats. So, hopefully in your last 45 minutes or so you've had the opportunity to work through each of the four pieces of this model, the governing principles, governing body substructure, legislative structures. You've heard some polling questions to you. We're going to throw more. What we'd like to do now, thank you, please find your seats, we'd like to do now is go through each of the four elements of the model and you'd change or not. We'll go through each element. Microphone folks are ready in the back. Please hold up your little letters. Microphone people, hold up your letters. I see C, that's about it. Where is everybody else? Microphone people, hold up your letters, ready for the conversation. So this is where you get to tell us how you would do this differently, all right. So we'll ask some thoughts, table thoughts, you want to share just about governing principles. Raise your hand and a mike person will come to you or all come to you. Okay, C has one. Governing principles only, tell us about governing principles.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'm representing the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Following our discussion yesterday during the dialogue SAAC got together and we students comments that we would like to bring to this entire group. There's been a lot of rhetoric around this room about how important the student-athlete voice is. My challenge to this Committee is that the proof is in the pudding and we are all hungry for change. Part of the change must be to include student-athletes at the highest level of governance because we are the only ones affected by these rules 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. How could anyone truly know how student-athletes are being affected by the rules without actually talking to student-athletes. We provide meaningful insight and I would submit to you that those individuals we have spoken with have deemed a valuable perspective in speaking with us and hearing our concerns. Therefore, any body that is going to create and pass legislation related to student-athletes must have a student-athlete on that body with a voting or advisory role at every single level. Omitting student-athletes and SAAC from the chart has left student-athletes in the position of being added only as an afterthought, leaving the impression that the student-athlete voice is not as meaningful as we have been led to believe in the past. Thank you.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So now I will assume that in addition to the structures that the students are involved in it's really important for governing principles.

MR. SCHULZ: Thank you, I'd like to ask a follow-up, so what would you propose?

FROM THE FLOOR: I would propose that similar to how the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee has functioned on the different committees and in the working groups that have been formed as of late that we sit in on these committees, that we engage with the committees however structure it is, however they are comprised, there is a student-athlete on each of those councils, committees, whatever it may be, that comes out of that, that we are involved because we are engaged by our student-athletes on the campus and conference levels and we constantly are in communication and we have a unique ability to really shed our conference and sport affiliations when we are in those rooms and really provide that feedback that is so valuable about how the rules are affecting us, so that's how I would see us.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So let's talk about other feedback on the governing principles then we'll move on. Anybody else have anything on governing principles?

FROM THE FLOOR: Our table talked about that and we would look at combining the guiding principles and the core values and call that core values as opposed to guiding principles as the basis of moving forward.

It is a little bit like we talked about yesterday, single impactful words that will be the basis for things to move forward.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Folks, on the governing principles, was there anything that you disagreed with, was anything that you think is missing? Any comments you have on this?

FROM THE FLOOR: Our table agreed that we would like under the collegiate model to see the word amateurism explicitly included.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Thank you. Other comments about governing principles, what's missing, what would you change.

FROM THE FLOOR: In this section on widespread competitive opportunity we thought that it needed to be a statement in there about equitable access to championships added.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Thank you, C.

FROM THE FLOOR: Our table, what the missing piece is that relates to our values is the inclusion and gender of principles.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Other additions or changes to governing principles? Governing principles? No comment? Microphones? Other comments on governing principles?

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi, we have a few comments. One is that we want to see student-athletes success added to the well being. We thought that the next three points could be condensed into one since it all went to the academic mission. I contribute a lot to UCLA, sorry. In response of this we thought that the driver needs to be that these things are responsive to student success and well being at all times and that that has to be part of the evaluation there.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Anything else about governing principles? Anybody else? All right, let's move onto governing body. Did anybody have any substantive conversation about the governing body about the wording? G, please.

FROM THE FLOOR: I am a member of the PAG and PAG as you know as you've stated before has been very involved in these discussions for quite awhile now, and we met recently and we came up with a series of issues that we'd like to see addressed in both the body as well as in the legislative issues. I think I speak for the PAG. First, we are committed to one Division 1 organization with current access to the NCAA championships and make this a distribution model as it exhibits. Secondly, although we believe very strongly in the idea of full representation as a membership organization and as presidents who have the ultimate responsibility for what happens within the athletics in sub-play level as well as our institutions, we feel that each conference should be fully represented on the Board. However, we're also willing to support an alternative model if that's more in line with what the entire organization wants to go with, and that would be a smaller Board, a more nimble Board a much more strategic Board similar to the way the Board holds the responsibility as defined here, but a Board that has equal voting across various categories and could be across subdivisions of some sort, but there has to be equal voting within that small more nimble Board with various subdivisions being represented on that, including possibly a category of others which may include outside folks who are other members of the NCAA, but again the idea of equal voting there exists. And a part of that would be that the 32 member Presidents Council that would really meet basically once a year to meet with the Board itself to talk about the upcoming agenda for the following year. Board probably would meet quarterly and the 32 Presidents Council would meet on a one-time basis with the Board and that's actually taken place a little bit recently where the PAG and Board met on some

various issues so there's some precedence there. And the last component of this model are we support the autonomy for the Big Five conferences, high-resource conferences, however also stated there probably needs to be some exclusions, some checks and balances, some transparency of those issues because even though our issues will be identified as being autonomous there is probably still some other impacts it has for the rest of us that we need to be able to address, but the concept is fully supported and endorsed and it's realistic given the differences in resources. But attached to that then is the idea of shared governance issues which pertain to all of us that whatever those issues are they are addressed on equal voting basis as well, no weighted voting in that category. So the idea being that Board be nimble, needs to be much more representative in terms of equal voting but also have these areas of certain issues be addressed by the appropriate groups that have control over them but understand there's going to be a lot of issues, spillover issues, that impact our organization.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Steering Committee have any comments, questions, regarding that? Thank you. Let's hear from some other folks. I have A.

FROM THE FLOOR: Our proposal is that at this point in time the Board consists of 32 members eliminating the need to create a balancing act between the Board and the PAG. The proposed committee structure would allow such a Board to function appreciably and appropriately as would modern technology and methodologies in process. We believe that the council should be shared by an AD who is a member of the Board. With this structure in place the whole question of weighted voting can take place. We also acknowledge that perhaps this model serves as a transitional Board until full confidence in the shared governance of this organization is restored.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Excellent, thank you so much. Steering Committee, comments? B?

FROM THE FLOOR: I've noted throughout the document, and our table did as well, when referring to folks that needed to be included in the process it seems that there's been an omission of the SWA title and that the SWA is typically a senior member of most of our Athletic Department staffs, that when we talk about the inconclusiveness of athletic directors and FARs that SWAs also be added to those categories.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Comments about the Board? How about the Board? Comments about the Board?

FROM THE FLOOR: One of the things we were concerned about with this model on page 7 we were concerned that the management component as listed under the roles and responsibilities of the Board is probably misdirected by saying that it's a matter of partnering with the staff to determine how the association can serve its membership. Rather it should be partnering with the membership through the Board subcommittees and councils. The oversight of the staff we feel that it's probably the CEO's responsibility. It's something that should be left to the CEO largely to determine whether or not we're occupying the time of the Board, which is going to be limited. We were also conscious of the exclusion of SWAs at our table. We felt that the SWAs along with the students and also with the faculty, the FARs and other faculty have been largely marginalized in focus of this conversation. We would like to see those restored. In terms of the roles of the Board, we were also concerned that the idea of having subcommittees for the Board that could intrude upon the function of councils was something that needed to be worked out at this stage; that if the Board needed subcommittees on matters such as finance or communication or things that were not handled by councils and subcommittees then -- excuse me by councils then that would be an appropriate way to set up sub-committees. But in all cases where the councils has functions that would be the topics of any proposed subcommittee of the Board rather than appoint Board members to those councils so they can be fully educated and operate as de facto subcommittees of the Board on those issues and not duplicate the work of the councils and perhaps intercede them.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: I heard some good conversation throughout this confusion about bringing

others on the subcommittees of the Board. David?

MR LEEBRON: I think that's a very good point and I think we need to look a little harder on how we describe that. I think one idea actually of the subcommittees is to prevent the Board from getting over-engaged on these issues by having the folks who have been involved at the council level, as I think Jean described, liaison with the Board, make sure their aren't sort of huge issues that the Board somehow needs to address, then the subcommittees would come report to the Board so that's sort of two different ways to think about this. One is that the subcommittees would be over-engaged in redoing work of the council and the other is that the subcommittees will help prevent the Board by making sure issues that should be routine are routine. So I think what we are trying to aim for is to, in my view, is the latter one, where by having this subcommittee work with ADs and others in the subcommittee to make sure we've understood what you've been trying to do or the council has been trying to do and then advise the Board that it does not need to get over-engaged in the issues. So we may need to work a little harder to make sure the subcommittees work in that way and not the way that you're concerned about.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: I also want to acknowledge that in a lot of the feedback we got last night there were questions folks had about what's the role of staff and what's the role of the president and how does it all work, so I want to acknowledge that that's there. I want to just say for the Steering Committee that the idea of a partnership in a model is really important so that was, again, I think another principle that maybe we didn't get on paper but it's very, very important. B back there.

FROM THE FLOOR: Just a couple of quick comments. On the competency-based approach one of the things we talked about here was that that be a peer-reviewed based system rather than a staff function. We think it's very important that ADs look at ADs and should be in these groups and others so that we get the best of the best to sit on these different Boards and committees. Then, secondly, as we look to engage our different constituencies that we not overlook the coaches that provide so much of our economic well being but have their career so impacted by regulations that drive the business model that we currently work under. So we'd ask that the coaches be considered as we move forward on this whole area. Thank you.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: C.

FROM THE FLOOR: Jean, we had three points to make here if we could. First of all, as it relates to roles and responsibilities. We thought that what's listed should be changed a little bit and boiled down into four categories; strategy, policy, financial oversight and evaluate the CEO. We thought that the legislative component and the management component could actually be eliminated. Point No. 2 was that we realized there was an awful lot that would need to be done to get to this point in the composition. We thought the composition should be smaller rather than larger, maybe a number of seven to nine. We know there's an awful lot to go into how that would be comprised and who would make up those seven to nine, but thought smaller was a better route to go. Then the final point we raised, which I think is historical in nature, I think as we work through this process we need to ensure that history doesn't repeat itself because anybody that went through this process back in 2007 when we had the reorganization to the current structure, in that current structure the goal when the Legislative Council was put into place would be that the Board would get out from under the minutia. And the problem, one of the things that brings us here today to talk about not only the Board composition but also some of the other categories that we'll talk about in a few minutes is that that didn't happen. It was the thought that it was going to happen but it didn't happen so we need to be careful that history doesn't repeat itself.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: You made some comments about a couple points. So one is that, as I said yesterday, a lot of what you see on paper is structure. Things like process and culture, things that will hopefully help create a more sustaining model over time, that's an important piece. I'm sort of hearing a theme I heard from a couple of folks. This is going to take some time, right, and I even heard some thoughts back here

that said we'd like to get to a small Board eventually. Maybe there's a transition step, right. So I think that's an interesting dynamic to think about. Could there be some endings we get into a couple of years, could there be some type of transitional structure possibility and Steering Committee would want to consider some of those things as well. I think it's important to think about this. So once we finally decide, there needs to be an implementation process that helps to move us, fairly painlessly, from where we are today to where we need to go, so I think that's important, kind of important transition, maybe some transitional kinds of structures.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'm now speaking for our table here and that would be, you know, as we looked at the structure there's too many people reporting to the Board of Directors. I mean clearly. That's from our table that we believe that. For our Board if they are going to operate at the 50,000-foot level then go ahead and entrust your Management Council to be able to handle a number of these other issues. Take the academic sub-council, move that underneath the Management Council, whatever we end up calling the Council that reports to the Board of Directors. Don't worry about the legislative matters right now on having their own council. You need to have a council, we think, that reflects student-athlete well being. Where are we focusing on things other than the academic needs of our student-athletes and make sure that those sub-councils are populated with student-athletes. Make sure they are populated with coaches and ADs and SWAs and FARs and we've got that, right, from a competency-based standpoint. Finally, as you look at that we are questioning, we don't have an answer for this, questioning on why the Committee on Infractions and the Infractions Appeals Committee needs to be reporting to the Board of Directors. Again we don't have an answer for that. We just saw that as an out-liar, so that's our thoughts.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So we're talking about governing body and substructure, kind of transitioning in that. I think again that as you've had these conversations you realize how inter-related all these pieces are so governing body, legislative structure, comments, thoughts. C. Thank you.

FROM THE FLOOR: Again I'm reporting on behalf of our table. And I think the elephant in the room that really hasn't been talked about is that the reality of how business is actually currently being done in Division 1 is really not the issue and not the guiding principles, so if we could get to the meat of how things are actually happening I think that's really crucial for today. The other added language we think should be added to the guiding principles that there's no language about revenue and how that really impacts our decision making.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: By the way, along the lines of revenue, so if it's at the principle level maybe it's more about stewardship. You think stewardship of resources, is that a possibility?

MR. SCHULZ: Jean, for the person who just stood up, can you provide some clarification on your first point?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: What's going on today would be the question?

FROM THE FLOOR: For example, the conference realignment. When you look at what's been happening over the last few years a lot of the student-athlete well being is really not at the forefront of that. It's been really driven by revenue.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay. E. Thank you.

FROM THE FLOOR: The term that's been used a lot here in this room today is marginalized and I don't want to get into a race to be part of the group that feels the most marginalized, but the structures that we're putting together here and the layers in this, in the substructure, would be like developing a campus-governed structure that involves the students on your campus, that involves administrators and has no faculty. The coaches are people who spend 10 hours with student-athletes for every 15 minutes spent by anybody else on the campus and

there is no place in an organized fashion where their input into this substructure, doesn't have to be at the Board of Directors level, we are all for the student-athlete voice. We respect and cede authority to athletic administrators for the big picture. But we are the people who are with the student-athletes and we are the ones who are most responsible for whether they have a quality athletic experience or not and we believe that coaches should be part of this infrastructure.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Let me ask a dumb question that I heard in some conversation that what things did you talk about at your table that exist on your campuses and in your institutional governing structures you think should or shouldn't be a part of the makeup of the structure as one? What things? Did anybody talk about those things, what should be brought and what shouldn't about how your higher campus governance works? Food for thought, food for thought. All right, continued conversation about substructure, is anybody ready to move to legislative substructure we'd be happy to take some of those comments as well.

FROM THE FLOOR: On page 11 of the document you talk about legislative structure principles. It says agreement on legislative autonomy for the five big conferences and their institutions over regulations that are most sensitive to the differentiation of institutions. I think we all understand what that is about and where that is leading but here's my question. When we get down to the actual nuts and bolts of how this is going to be put together are we going to have a specification of those particular areas where that legislative autonomy could be exercised and areas where that is not going to be the case or how is this going to be structure? Because if this is not fairly clearly indicated it seems to me it gives this group virtual freedom to do what it will. I think some of us are concerned about that. We recognize that there are areas where the five big conferences want to have their independence but we want to be sure that doesn't get too big and too expansive.

MR. SCHULZ: I appreciate the comment. As we were discussing this over the last several months fairly intently and I know there's been a lot of proposals floated by differing groups about how we handle the autonomy issues in a reasonable fashion and there have been some really a great dialogues, I think we felt that we had to have some sort of a general structure that there might be some consensus first, and then once we have some sense of what that structure might look like then we really can tackle in a meaningful way very specific proposals about how that autonomy would work. If we try to do it backwards from that and say, well, let's talk about the autonomy first, then we'll get to the general structure second, I think we felt or I felt that we really weren't putting ourselves in a position to be successful. Now, for you all in the audience that's frustrating to say there's an elephant in the room and we want to see some details now so I know sort of what I'm buying before I get home and open the box, but I think this is a natural order of steps that we need to take. So once we have some sense of what the structure would look like then we've got to dive down and develop a way to deal with the issues today that the Big Five or five most resource conferences are interested in, what those issues might be in the future and how we would deal with things like voting or what gets on that agenda, what's done for the betterment of Division 1, how's that all handled, there's some meaty issues that there that we still need to deal with but the structure and some of that stuff, I think, has to be kind of first. Some of that is my opinion. I don't want to put words in the mouth of my colleagues here but this is an active dialogue amongst us with how to do that well with other groups, many of which are represented in the room.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: I will also say in observing the Committee's work they started with this broad view of what does the structure need to look like and didn't start with what specific groups needs some expectation and it's a very balanced approach and something we need to know.

FROM THE FLOOR: One thing that might be helpful as you work on this structure is to think of the concept of Board accountability. That might actually make a lot of people feel more comfortable with whatever structure you finally decide on. Just as a corporate Board is ultimately responsible to the shareholders, the Board of Directors of the Division 1 group needs to be responsible to everyone in this room, the students, the coaches, the presidents, the administrators and I would recommend that you have some sort of a regular

feedback, transparent feedback, to the Board on how well they are representing everyone in Division 1.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: If I could just make a comment on that. Good governance practice suggests that there is Board-level assessment, that's there's good feedback process about the Board's own process, and one of those dynamics needs to be in the center in which the membership feels it's been well represented by governance. It's important.

FROM THE FLOOR: We would agree that this is really where the meaty issues start coming up and we would recommend that the process as we go forward and the time line is well communicated and open to suggestion and recommendations of certainly from people within this room because this is really where the rubber meets the road in a lot of cases, so being part of that process to help decide how that all works would be the recommendation of this group.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Excellent. Thank you.

FROM THE FLOOR: So I appreciate the fact that, President Schulz, you mentioned that you haven't really worked out the details yet but you'd like to get some consensus around the general approach to autonomy, so I would just hope that there's some openness to the idea that the distribution model could also be open for consideration given that we all know what the details of autonomy is going to look like, that we would also be open to how the distribution model of revenue for all of us would be open for consideration going forward.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: G.

FROM THE FLOOR: I just want to add onto the points that had been made about autonomy from the gentleman from Northeastern as well as from Appalachian State. Our table focused on the principle of legislative autonomy. We agreed there should be legislative autonomy but it needs to be extended beyond just the high resource, Big Five conferences and should include all of the FBS schools. We agree that full cost of attendance principles needs to be addressed and that that's a core issue. We also think that matters pertaining to things such as number of scholarships, transfer rules and membership rules are fundamental to maintaining a reasonably level playing field that should require super majority principles with regard to voting to maintain that sense of a level playing field.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: C.

FROM THE FLOOR: Our table had two things that we thought were important to talk about. The first one is we don't think that Ad Hoc Committees need to be included in the structure; that if this is a significant issue that it should be able to be handled by any of the councils that have been set up. And going along with the repeating of history, I think that's what we felt happened with the numbers of the working groups. The second issue had to do with autonomy of a different type. We've talked a lot about the autonomy of the five groups, but on page 8 it talks about the full authority of the Board without override, and I think clarification of what autonomy by the Board is really important to this group, and again not repeating history, and the importance of override to individual institutions. That really is the only tie that every single institution has that they feel they have an immediate impact in the governing structure.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So legislative substructure, legislative structure, anybody?

FROM THE FLOOR: Three quick observations. One, size of the council struck us in terms of the model as being too large with the ball park of 36 people to be effective or efficient and that should be something that should be considered. Second, with respect to issue areas for autonomy, we know of some today and those are listed, but we wouldn't want to be so rigid that we would close off the possibility if there are some issues over the

horizon three or four years from now that we're not recognizing. , in terms that if there are challenges in pulling off autonomy within the Big Tent approach we wondered how open the group is still to other alternatives. As one you know the one FAR is against the possibility of a fourth or FDS division. Thank you.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Next set of comments from somewhere? You must have comments. What else do you want to talk about today in the legislative structure, what questions did you think about? Is it fair to say that there were more questions than recommendations?

MR. EMMERT: One of the dynamics that I heard most during the break in chatting with some of you and some of the comments right now is there's an obvious overlap or confusion about the respective roles of the Board and the council. And I think it might be useful to hear from the subcommittee members what their thoughts are and what the relationship between the Board and the council could be and what their intention was, because I've heard comments that suggest that this is still -- what's being proposed is still very much a Board-centered model; that legislative decisions and all of the reporting lines are flowing up to the Board. And I think the organization chart sounds or suggests that and that the actions might be over in these sub-council areas, not in and out of the council itself, and that the role of the council might be less than what I heard comments coming from the Steering Committee as you all are envisioning it. So perhaps you can help by providing just your own views of what you think the relationship between the cabinet -- excuse me, the council and the Board would be.

MS. CHENG: Well, a huge underlying principle of our work was to create this council that would be empowered to really act on the legislative and the work of the governance and that the Board would get out of the way in feeling that we had to approve every detail that was happening at that council level. We also spent a lot of time talking about the importance of practitioners and ADs being there because we all as presidents we turn to our athletic directors and ask questions about what does this mean, what's the impact, and we really wanted to empower that council to make those decisions knowing the consequences and the positives that were intended. We probably then in our own thinking, being CEO driven, countered that with some things on this org chart that may have diluted that, and given this feedback today and yesterday I think we've got some work to do to really kind of coalesce all those ideas about that council and make sure that it doesn't get watered down as this feedback suggests.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Other comments?

MR. PASTIDES: Within my conference, within the SEC, legislative affairs are by and large initiated and handled by the athletic directors with lot of input from the FARs, the SWAs and coaches, but eventually when we go to vote the president and the AD sit literally side by side in a room and there's one hand that goes up for the final vote, usually it's the president's hand, not usually, it is the president's hand. So I think in establishing the council we recognize that there's no way for the Board of presidents who aren't nearly as engaged in where the rubber meets the road, as it has been said many times, to take the major initiative role in legislation, but to allow legislation to go forward without the presidents' involvement would be abrogating, I think, responsibility so I think that's the kind of model that we're looking for here.

MR. DRAKE: I would say to that, you know, we all have lots of responsibilities in these roles. This is one of them. As we come together for the Board it's actually not possible or practical for us to be able to get into the meat enough to really know what we're doing. We can provide reasonable oversight and guidance and those types of things but the real work needs to be done by the people who live this day in and day out and that really was our intention all along. That includes all the various groups that have stood and said, Gee, what we do is really critically important to students and coaches and the ADs and the FARs and SWAs. We understand that those are the people who do the work and live this and really it's their good work on the council that move things forward and then get it to a place where we can fly in, come together, look at things and understand it and make reasonable judgments about going forward. That's the hope that I have.

MR LEEBRON: I think there's been a fair amount of conversation about trust and I think one of the important things is that the trust has to go both ways. I think one of the things we were aiming at is to create a council that we would trust, and I think there's still some sort of work to be done on that, but I think one of the things we are most familiar with as presidents, as others have alluded to, is we are used to working directly with our ADs. And that's not to say I think a lot of very good points have been made about who else needs to be in the room or the importance of student voices in the room, and we didn't mean to preclude any of that in kind of the structures that we set out. But I think our goal was really to create a council sort of from the bottom up where we could say, We trust this council and therefore at the end of the day we don't need to be second guessing all of their decisions. We need a little bit of oversight as we do generally because ultimately this is our responsibility. When things go wrong in athletics they do land on our desks and so we have to have some kind of oversight responsibility, but what we really wanted was a council where we would say, We know who's in this room, we may not hand pick them, but we work daily with our ADs. We trust them on our campuses. There is no reason we shouldn't trust them in this context as well. And what we ultimately recognize with the Senior Women Administrators or coaches or students that many of those voices need to be in the process, but we need, just as you need a Board that you can trust sort of in part to keep its hands off, we need a council that we can trust to be the most forceful and engaged piece in this process and that's what's we've been aiming for.

MR. BLOCK: I think we've captured exactly what we're thinking about here. I mean I just want to emphasize we think about this is a bi-directional relationship. Council isn't just carrying out the wishes of the Board; that this works both ways, strategy and all the important elements of moving in new directions, actually also focuses up for the council and Board. That's the working relationship with the council that plays an essential role actually in our activities.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Comments? C.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'd like to follow up on that trust issue as it relates to the legislative process. When we began these discussions some six or eight months ago we talked about the need for the high resource conferences to have autonomy on certain legislative areas, and I think there's some consensus that's developed around that, with some oversight by the Board and some mechanism for override. But as we start talking about shared governance I think the trust issue has to work both ways in that if we are giving up autonomy on a series of issues then when we get to the shared governance it should be equal representation among all 32 conferences. So I'd like to at least have the Steering Committee comment on how they view shared governance. Thank you.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Steering Committee, would you like to comment on shared governance?

MR. HATCH: We have begun discussions but most of those issues are to be worked out in the future.

MR. PASTIDES: I think there are multiple points of view. That's not a compound. I think the reality is that there are multiple points of view on that matter within this Committee.

MS. CHENG: Michael and I certainly have had that same discussion with the PAG group and you heard the highlights of that discussion and there certainly is multiple points of view within the Steering Committee and within the Association.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: C?

FROM THE FLOOR: Our table talked about how for this legislative structure to work legislation needs to follow our governing principles with student-athlete well being being at the forefront of that. And we felt that one way to do this was for legislation to have something on it that says when it's proposed what is -- what gov-

erning principles it's falling into. Is this going to enhance student-athlete well being, because if our legislation is to be meaningful it has to follow our principles that we set forth.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Just a quick comment about that. It's very interesting, an organization with really robust strategic plans and principles. There is an attachment, you know, to what goal are we trying to accomplish, where does it fit our principles. I think that would be a very interesting way of sort of keeping that front and center. I have D.

FROM THE FLOOR: I will admit to being the 300-pound elephant in the room. I'm going to just offer up a question that I think that everyone in the room has asked themselves. Why is it that everyone else thinks that they can do my job. As a president you deal with academic senates who think they can do your job. Boards of Trustees, some members that think that they can do your job. Politicians, members of the public. As athletic directors, members of the media, alumni, fans think they can do your job. Commissioners, athletic directors, members of the media think they can do your job. I look at the model and I see page 14 which actually in my view should be page 1. That should be what guides the operation of the Association. The Board of Directors' sole function should be to ensure that the Association functions under the core principles. Cede operational control to your athletic directors like you cede control on your campuses to members of your cabinet, to your deans, to your faculty. I think the model should be one in which the Board is policy approving and not policy making.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Thank you. Comments? Again I'm very interested and intrigued by the importance of core values in this conversation, perhaps for even a more robust set of input and consideration on this. That's very important, thank you.

FROM THE FLOOR: Couple of observations. 1, as University President I'd love to have, as my colleagues in D-II and D-III have, like on a day like today presidents' meeting where the presidents and chancellors of D-I, all of D-1, can get together and have a conversation. No. 2, as a refugee from D-II, I'd love to see D-I Saturday morning like D-II and D-III do is have their own business meeting, whether it lasts five minutes or 55 minutes or 5 hours and a half. I'm a big fan of Management Councils and Presidents Councils. If it's working so poorly in D-II and D-III where aren't they getting rid of it and why are we trying to go to look to something like they got, so why do we have to reinvent the wheel and not maybe start there. The other thing I will observe and I think this was influenced by conversations I had with a couple people and the word is really checks and balances. You know, for 237 years this United States of America hasn't had a Board of Directors. We've had a Congress with a weighted group and an equal group. We've had a Supreme Court that kind of overlooks and changes the rules that they don't like. We have an Executive Branch that we like or don't like what they do but we let them do their job. Every four years, every two years, every six years we have a chance to vote them if we don't like them. There's a wheel that we don't have to go reinvent that we seriously might want to think about and I think if we had checks and balances your trust level is going to go straight up because you're going to know you have a chance to override, you know you're going to have a chance to appeal, you know you're going to have a chance to do something differently. And the other thing, as University President I've got two or three outside groups that advise me. What's wrong with letting the president of the NCAA have a Presidential Advisory Group that consists of some of these independent leaders in the U.S., the world, the Olympics, pro sports, whatever it is, for presidents, maybe they don't have a vote. Maybe they don't have any membership on the Board. But maybe the president of NCAA has the ability once a year, twice a year, to get some organized good feedback and maybe that accomplishes, I notice we voted that we kind of didn't want outsiders on the in, but maybe that gives the organization another opportunity to have the valuable input of some outsiders that might want to come in and say, Hey, your guys are doing the greatest thing since sliced bread or, Are you thinking about what you're doing? That is the dumbest thing I've ever heard of, and I think that all works together where the president advises the Board, staff advises the Board, Supreme Court function is able to say, Time out, we can't do that and every Saturday morning once a year 350 schools get one vote on whatever the issues are and off we go. Observation.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Excellent, thank you. Any comments from the Steering Committee? Next set of thoughts. A, please.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'd just like to follow up on Rich Enser's comment regarding the general agreement that it seems appropriate certainly for the five high resources conferences to have the autonomy in the appropriate areas but also there is a strong sense of having equal voting weighted in the shared voting areas. And the subcommittee commented on that at your request that that's something they really haven't been delving into that much and certainly are going to consider. But perhaps maybe it's appropriate to get a sense of this group with our voting ability of how important is it for the shared governance area to be able to have equal voting for all the membership.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Perfect. That's exactly what we're going to do in a minute or so. I want us to pause for a minute and think about that. What questions do we want to get a sense of this room from. We can continue the conversation. I want you to just take a second and think about it and we're going to do a little dynamic process using our voting equipment to do that. So am I hearing that we'd like to have some sense in the room about the concept of legislative autonomy? Is that a question? Am I getting nods from that? Yeah, what else? Take a couple seconds and just sort of jot some things down, talk with your tables for a few minutes. We can actually do this in a dynamic way. What questions do we need to get a sense in this room about? Take about five minutes or so and try to draft a few questions.

(A BRIEF BREAK WAS TAKEN AT THIS TIME.)

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay, you all have some questions? Let's reconvene. Thank you. So I want to do one thing first before we take some questions to put to the polling. I want to do a region or demographics of who's in the room today so we get a pretty good sense of who we are again. Some folks couldn't make yesterday but are here today, et cetera, so grab your polling equipment. You all with me? First question was give us your subdivision affiliation. 15 seconds for that. FBS, FCS or D-I. So results, please. Okay. 43 FBS, 30 percent FCS, 27 percent, okay, thank you. Second demographic question about position, please. 15 seconds for this. Okay, so ADs, fewer presidents than yesterday. Okay. So let's hear from some folks with a question you want to pose to the polling. I think C was first and then I'll go to you.

FROM THE FLOOR: Question from our table is do you support the NCAA enforcement process being outsourced?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: We haven't talked about enforcement. Can we hold that one till we have a little conversation about it? No, okay, you want to have a conversation about it? What do people want to talk about enforcement? I haven't heard that come up at all.

FROM THE FLOOR: Not specifically a comment about it but hasn't come up but it's on the chart, so I think it's an appropriate question.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So the question is, read it again, I want everybody to listen and what I want you to do is use your polling to answer that question.

FROM THE FLOOR: Question is do you support the NCAA enforcement process being outsourced.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay, 15 seconds. Do you support the NCAA process being outsourced. 15 second clock, please. Do you support the NCAA enforcement process being outsourced. And the results are, wow, interesting. Kind of all over the place. 16, 29 support, 20 percent neutral, 22 oppose, 13 strongly oppose. Looks like some conversation needs to happen there. Let's hear B.

FROM THE FLOOR: We had three questions. One is is maintaining the override crucial? Another is should there be a transitional model? That was proposed earlier. And No. 3 is if there is a transitional model is this format, the Division I dialogue, useful in promoting transparency and establishing communication and trust during the transitional phase.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: You want to vote on those? All right, give us the first one.

FROM THE FLOOR: Is maintaining the override crucial?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So to what degree is maintaining the override crucial?

MR. HATCH: Override can be a variety of percentages. Is the question maintaining the override at the current percentage?

FROM THE FLOOR: Can you restate the current percentages for all of us?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Who has knowledge on maintaining the current percentages?

MR. EMMERT: 62 percent.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: 62 percent.

FROM THE FLOOR: So we would accept that and say 62 1/2 percent, reasonably high.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So question is to what degree do you support maintaining the override process at its current level. Yes? Okay. 15 seconds to vote on that. To what degree do you support maintaining the current override process. To what degree do you support maintaining the override process at its current level, strongly support and support. Okay, what was the second question?

FROM THE FLOOR: Should there be a transitional model.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: We talked about that a little earlier. It's going to take a while to do this. Should this Steering Committee consider a transitional model. 15 seconds for that. Should the Steering Committee consider a transitional model. Should the Steering Committee consider a transitional model. Strongly oppose, wow. That's interesting. Would anybody care to speak to why? That's a significant amount of opposition. Is it a sense of we need to move forward? Is it a sense that things are kind of broken? Who wants to speak to that?

FROM THE FLOOR: Don't you think that we've been in a transitional model for a couple of years?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Thank you. Anybody else have any thoughts on that? Anybody else? Transitional model. Okay. What's the third question? I'm sorry, did the other question -- all right. Third question.

FROM THE FLOOR: The third question was really if yes transitional, but I would still propose is this format, a dialogue, useful in the process as we move into a new governance structure?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Is this dialogue process useful as we move into a new governance structure, and to what degree, maybe is the question, to what degree is this dialogue process a useful model as

we move into the governance restructure. 15 seconds, 15 seconds. To what degree is this a useful model. Okay. Okay, Question 4, to what degree do you think this form is a useful model, pretty strong support, some neutral. Okay, anybody have a comment on those thoughts? Anybody want to comment on this forum? All right, next question, C. What question did you want?

FROM THE FLOOR: To what extent does the group believe that the model that's being discussed will enhance the public perception of the NCAA or reduce the external risks such as litigation.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Way too long a question to get out. Slowly, all right.

FROM THE FLOOR: Does the group believe --

MODERATOR FRANKEL: To what extent does the group believe.

FROM THE FLOOR: Right, to what extent does the group believe that the model that's being discussed will enhance the public perception of the NCAA and reduce the external risks including litigation.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So enhance the public perception and reduce the external risks. To what degree does this proposed model enhance the public reputation and reduce external risks. 15 seconds on that. Public perception, reduce external risks. Wow, not strong enough, not enough? What are the thoughts about that, anybody? Anybody want to comment? Any comment on that? Yeah, somebody please give that person a mike.

FROM THE FLOOR: Our perspective is that the public perception of the NCAA is that it makes its decisions principally on the bases that are revenue driven, not driven by academic values of the institutions they represent, and I oppose on that or low probability because I thought this change does not propose this type of imbalance perception.

MR. SCHULZ: I'd like to propose the question is the group supportive of changing the override, current override structure?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Changing the override up or down?

MR. SCHULZ: I'm sorry?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Changing the override in what way? Changing in general?

MR. SCHULZ: Changing in general. Is everybody satisfied with the way the override system works?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: We did that one.

MR. SCHULZ: I was in the bathroom, excuse me.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Obviously.

MR. SCHULZ: I didn't like the results so I want to vote again.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Answer is no. Come on, you guys. These are softball questions. I want to hear the serious questions. How about A back there. A? No, okay, B.

FROM THE FLOOR: On the issue of shared governance I'd like to see a poll taken on whether or not shared governance should mean equal representation by all 32 conferences.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Can I ask a question before that? Does everybody sufficiently understand what we mean by shared governance, yes or no? Let me hear some noise. Yes? No? Some nos over here. Anybody want to make any comments on -- Steering Committee want to make any comments on how you define shared governance and we'll go to that poll in a second, Rich. Anybody?

MR. EMMERT: You know, I'll take a stab at it. There's shared governance as we all use the term generally but I suspect what Rich means is that the words shared governance have been used among a variety of groups here over the past six months to refer to that part of the legislative process that would not be covered by a zone of autonomy, right. So I was actually reading some tweaks, there was clearly a lot of confusion about what people mean when they say, well, what about the shared governance part of all this. So there has been, as I've listened to the conversation, there has been a debate about legislation that the five high resource institutions could have an area of autonomy and then there's everything else, and what would the voting model look like around everything else. That would be the zone of shared governance. Is that what you mean, Rich, with your question?

FROM THE FLOOR: That's right.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay, so what is the question about shared governance? How do you want to word it?

FROM THE FLOOR: Do you support shared governance on equal basis amongst all 32 conferences? **MODERATOR FRANKEL:** To what degree would you support shared governance on equal basis on all 32 conferences. 15 seconds. Okay, strongly support shared governance. So this is interesting. It's a little bifurcation here, I think, strongly support and strongly oppose. So what other kinds of questions, then I want to get us back into dialogue. Let's hear more questions first and kind of get a flavor and see if we want to pull some more. What do we have for G? **FROM THE FLOOR:** This question is addressed to the Steering Committee and I'd like to go back to the page 14, core values, and the first bullet of the collegiate model of athletics. Was there any thought given to particular high resource institutions? There are student-athletes who we accept into high institutions, clearly their vocation is to go to the professional level. So how does core values address accepting student-athletes who clearly want to go to the next level, question.

MR. PASTIDES: I think that's a good question. I've been concerned and many of us here about One And Done in men's basketball and we're told over and over again that's an NBA type thing. I think the way we accommodate that is to keep pushing and to keep making our perspectives known and one day that will change. That's my desire. So I think that the alternative, I think, is to relent and to give up on this core value. So the fact that things aren't ideal but also recognize that they are not completely in control of the NCAA is where we continue to push on that and make the rules even better. We want to graduate -- we want to recruit students who want to graduate from our universities. We want to graduate as many as possible.

MR. SCHULZ: I'd like to comment on that as well. I think it's important, too, that we remember that the huge vast majority of our student-athletes that come to all of our schools, their professional aspirations are to be doctors, lawyers, teachers and engineers and things like that and sometimes I want to be careful that we don't worry about the 2 percent and ignore the 98 percent that are there to get an education and participate in intercollegiate athletics. So I do acknowledge that that's a problem we have to deal with. It's a huge perception issue out there that I just want us to remember always that the vast majority are not designed for professional careers in sports.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: All right, so what needs to be talked about that we haven't talked

about? What other burning issues are on your mind? I have C and then B over here. What are the burning issues on your mind? Questions for the Steering Committee, questions you'd like to get a sense on.

FROM THE FLOOR: We'd like to know should the areas of autonomy be determined first before determining the make-up of the Board.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Should the areas of autonomy be determined first before the make-up of the Board. Okay. Let's kind of get a sense of what other questions are out there. What do you have out there, B or C?

FROM THE FLOOR: I would just like to get a sense of the group on the PAG rules that was actually presented for a smaller nimble Board, eight, 10, nominated CEO/AD and then a 32 representative legislative council or leadership council underneath that with representation from all conferences, the one that was described earlier, just a sense of that structure make-up.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: What other questions? E over there.

FROM THE FLOOR: Our table we were inquiring on what everybody felt prior to the presidential retreat and working groups, do they really feel that this is a broken process.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Anyone want to comment on that? Say it again. This is kind of going back to where we were, right?

FROM THE FLOOR: Yeah, prior to the presidential retreat and rules working group was it a fully broken process or was it something that needed to be tweaked in some way to address the changes but not fully redesigned.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So the point there about how the structure as it was designed may have been something that was good and then went into the presidential retreat. I think Leadership Council had some of those conversations. Does anyone want to comment on that? That's going to be a good -- all right. G.

FROM THE FLOOR: Just to comment first on the idea of 2 percent versus the 98 percent, I would suggest that the conversation about autonomy feels similar; that based on the 60 or 70 schools compared to the 351 Division I that you are talking about a really small percentage but we're talking about making a fairly drastic change. So one of my questions though is are we prepared or interested in allowing the autonomy if there's some sort of change to the distribution model.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Other questions, C?

FROM THE FLOOR: Several of us have been here for seven hours and we're operating very firmly on the assumption that presidential chancellor control is a fundamental principle and I am actually interested in seeing whether this audience agrees that this is a fundamental principle.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: We had some conversation yesterday about formalities and things around it. E over here.

FROM THE FLOOR: This table would be very interested to find out if this group supports the existence of expanding committees between the council and the Board.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Next question, H.

FROM THE FLOOR: To what extent does this body support the concept of autonomy in still to be defined areas for the Big Five conferences.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: You want to take a vote on that one? Let's do the chancellor one first and we'll come back to exactly the way you worded that. Question to what extent does the room support?

FROM THE FLOOR: To what extent does the room support the fundamental principle of presidential and chancellor control of athletics.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: So we're going to do this now. To what extent does the room support the fundamental principle of presidential and chancellor control of intercollegiate athletics. 15 seconds. Two seconds, you're going to get voted off the island. Wow, look at that. They can stay on the stage, they don't have to be voted off the island? Excellent, very interesting. Thank you. Would you give us your question again?

FROM THE FLOOR: Assuming that you'll remember what I said. To what extent does the room support the concept of autonomy for the Big Five conferences in certain still to be defined areas.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: To what extent does the room support concept of autonomy for the five in still to be defined areas. 15 seconds. Okay. Let's take a look at this. Strongly support and support, couple folks are neutral. We're a little bit bifurcated on this. We're kind of all over the place but there's strong support and support, very interesting.

FROM THE FLOOR: Can we see it federated?

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Can we see it -- is there any demographics we can see on this particular one? We can see it afterwards but we can't right now. G, what do you want to do? **FROM THE FLOOR:** We had a different approach to the autonomy question. Is it autonomy by conference and therefore by the member of that conference you obtain that or is it by institution where institutions have autonomy and if the fellow members of their conference choose -- it's regulated by the conference, so if your conference doesn't want to regulate that they can but you have that choice of institutions to exercise that.

MR. HATCH: We've been working under the assumption this is by conference.

FROM THE FLOOR: Right, that's the question. Could we look at is it just an institution and the institution could exercise it as they choose and if the conference members as a group choose to exercise it or not then they can so choose as a self-regulating body within the conference.

MR. EMMERT: I think the word autonomy is a little bit confusing based on, again, what I've been hearing from all of you. The notion is that the autonomy would be about making the decision so that in those areas it would be defined as under the guise of autonomy the five conferences, if that's where you wound up, would have the ability to make legislative decisions autonomously about those areas. The rules themselves, whatever this might be, everyone talks about full cost of attendance, let's say that there was a proposal to do a full cost of attendance legislative change, those five could make that decision themselves without having to rely on a vote of the full body. But the rule itself would be permissive and would allow others who were outside of those five to also participate under that rule, if I'm answering your question. That's largely how the discussions have been flowing. Where you all wind up is another question but that's where it's been so far.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: E.

FROM THE FLOOR: Does the Board -- does the group, our group, all of us, does our group support the Board as the oversight body allowing all committees except for the PAG, all committees flow up through the council; in other words, including Committee of Infractions, Infractions Appeals Committee, Ad Hoc Committees, Standing Committees, all committees except for the PAG.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: You want to vote on that? So that would be so basically where the model is in terms of the connection between the substructure and the structure. Let's see what other questions, A.

FROM THE FLOOR: I was just hoping we could revisit some of the great questions that were asked previously all across the room and we have yet to poll.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Which one is significant, which one do you want to go back to? **FROM THE FLOOR:** In particular I was hoping to go back to the question that Commissioner McGlade (ph) asked.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: About?

FROM THE FLOOR: She could read it.

FROM THE FLOOR: I asked for a vote on what was read earlier about the PAG and their recommendation for smaller, nimble board and then a group of 32 representation.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay, so smaller, nimble Board, you want to vote on that one, smaller than 17, so to what degree would you support a smaller board than 17. Let's do that real quick.

MR. EMMERT: Jean, would Bernedette -- would you be okay with splitting those into two questions, smaller, nimble board and then this other entity?

FROM THE FLOOR: Absolutely, yeah, it's exactly the proposal that was read earlier by the president that was on the PAG, and so I think Rita was in the room yesterday as was Michael, so, yes, split it into two, the smaller, nimble Board and then the next layer of the 32 representation.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay, smaller, nimble Board, 15 seconds. Smaller, nimble Board. What degree would you support smaller, nimble Board, 15 seconds. Okay, strongly support and support for nimble Board, smaller, nimble Board. Second part of the question, Bernie, read it again.

FROM THE FLOOR: Representation of a council of president, athletic directors representing all 32 conferences.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Let's have some comment on the smaller, nimble Board first?

MR. SCHULZ: We talked about this general concept of a smaller Board several times and really this is one where the devil really gets into the details on how you go about instructing that. Who you leave off is probably a really critical factor. So say you have a Board of seven or eight you might say that's a great number but figuring out how in the hell you decide who those seven or eight are and how everybody else is off to the side is very, very challenging. So I understand the concept but the practical matter of this is really, really problematic.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay, so the second 86 part of Bernie's question was council of 32 with representation from all conferences; yes?

MR. EMMERT: Is that different than the council that's being proposed? Is that 32 -- just for clarifica-

tion, are you proposing a body in addition to the council?

FROM THE FLOOR: I'm not proposing anything. I'm just forwarding what was set forth yesterday from the PAG meeting, which I think Jean is pointing, they had it in writing maybe over on that side of the room.

FROM THE FLOOR: To answer your question, it's in addition to that council that's been laid out. It's the council of 32 presidents representing all conferences that would meet once a year with the Board, however that's constructed, to talk about agenda issues for the upcoming year.

MR. EMMERT: But without a formal relationship to the council? **FROM THE FLOOR:** Right, right.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay, so this would be a 32 member advisory board, presidential advisory board, yes, so to what degree would you support a 32 member presidential advisory board. To what extent, 15 seconds, would you support a 32 member presidential advisory board. Please vote on it. Okay, strongly support and support. I think there's a lot of support there. Okay, so we've had lots of conversations about lots of ideas. We've had some very, very interesting feedback that the Steering Committee has gotten. Do we have one other?

FROM THE FLOOR: Do we believe that by autonomy to the Big Five will preserve broad-based opportunities for student-athletes across the Division.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay, that's a good question. Any other questions about autonomy? Yeah, Jean, sorry.

FROM THE FLOOR: If we do adopt the principles of autonomy, lost my question now -- lost it.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: All right. So what else do you want a sense of the room on autonomy? As the Steering Committee has told you there's a lot of devil in the details on this. I think a real question is, you know, are we supportive of moving forward in some of these concepts. I think the Steering Committee has got some great input on that throughout this process. I think this process of input needs to continue as it continues its work. I think that the Steering Committee would like to hear from you in terms of maybe some advice for its sort of next steps and we talked about a lot of things. The question is is there any more substantive conversation that we want to get to, any more polling? What are folks thinking at this point? We could be here all day. We want to make the best use of your time. Who has a question? Yes, E.

FROM THE FLOOR: I would be interested in a poll on whether or not people think that if autonomy is carved out for football that it could be restricted to football or that it would be restricted to football. In other words, my concern is that I think it makes sense to allow a certain amount of autonomy in football-related matters but I don't see how that doesn't spill over into other sports for Title IX considerations and I think that I'd like to know does the room think that it's possible that autonomy could be restricted only to football matters.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: I'm going to propose a suggestion. I'm hearing such a rich and robust set of questions that I think the Steering Committee needs your thought process on and probably the thought process of folks that may not be in this room. What would you think about doing in the next couple days a quick survey work that would allow to us really capture all this in a substantive way and get some quick input for the Steering Committee as it plans its next meeting in the next couple weeks? We've had a lot of thought and lot of conversation here so I'm going to ask that as a question. Would you support a very short-term focused polling process via survey in the next week or so to really help us look at some of these questions?

Would you support that? To what degree? Polling process to allow us to look at all these questions and get some organized feedback back to the Board, Steering Committee? Okay, strongly support and support. Very few strongly oppose, excellent. So we will do that. We will create -- we've had an enormous -- how many hundred E-mails have we gotten today adding to the 600 yesterday, right, so we want to take all that input. Rather than just address this ad hoc we want to give you some focused opportunity for input so we're kind of -- we're going to do that and think about maybe just a few more comments and see where we are and see if we can wrap up. E over there, what comments do you have?

FROM THE FLOOR: I really appreciate the value of polling but I think it's a completely different dynamic than the quality of discussion we have in this kind of setting. And I don't have a solution but I think we're far better served in this environment than simply a pen and paper kind of polling.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Folks agree? It's very meaningful dialogue. We wanted to kind of get a mix of the polling to get a sense of people in the room, probably 800, to get that conversation informally. We still have an hour left. We would still love to get back into some of that dialogue but we want to get a sense of where your interests are right now in doing that. We talked about all four pieces of the model, do we want to get in depth into some things? C, what would you say on that?

FROM THE FLOOR: Who are you going to poll? People in the room when we get back or every Division I institution, president, FAR? In other words, the value is in the people here. But after that I do have another question I'd like answered.

MR. SCHULZ: You know I think our goal is as a subcommittee is to listen to many of the concepts, the things that have been brought forward, so when I look at the polling to me that gives a sense of the folks in the room what you all are thinking at the current time but we want to use that along with comments and other sorts of things. For example, in our conference we urged a lot of folks that we were already going to have good representation here but this doesn't represent everybody in our particular conference, so to me the polling helps us a little bit but it's also the comments, the questions, the discussions. And then we as a group go back and chew on a lot of these things and use this as information to try and tweak and improve and modify the model, so it's a sort of thing that more and more people say that's exactly what needs to happen. That's my viewpoint.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Take a few more comments and then I'm going to turn it back to the Steering Committee for some closing comments to kind of see where you are and kind of digest it. I think they probably feel like they are drinking from a firehose, what do you think, but in a good way, in a good way, all right, so think about closing comments. We'll go back to C.

FROM THE FLOOR: My question was is there any consideration for federating by sport, not just the football question, but a number of other sports that potentially could be federated where you could have coach's input and that would be a sport committee that would report to the council. And the other part of that is given all the realignment is there some potential for some sports aligning conferences on a more logical regional base which has a lot to do with student welfare.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Any other thoughts? A?

FROM THE FLOOR: I think if there's to be additional polling it might be helpful to go back to the night commission report of August 2013 where there were three concrete recommendations made and three suggestions for further study. I think they outlined a great deal of research and articulated the problems very well and it might be interesting to get a concrete response to those.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: I think I have time for one or two more comments. C.

FROM THE FLOOR: We would like to know if you agree the autonomy of Big Five conferences serves to preserve the collegiate model, the core values of the NCAA.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Good question. Anyone else back there? Jean, then we'll hear from the presidents in the closing comments.

FROM THE FLOOR: Back to the question I forgot. If we do, in fact, adopt the principles of autonomy for the high resource conferences do we agree that the scope of that autonomy should be clearly defined.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Okay, we've heard an enormous amount of information from you in the last six hours yesterday and today, an enormous amount of very, very helpful information for this Steering Committee. So I want to turn to them for a minute and let them reflect on what they have heard. The most important things, things that they will think about going forward and the things that they want to share with you about how they value very much your feedback. Who wants to start?

MR. PASTIDES: Well, I've reflected on the question that led to some humor about the transitional model and I think whatever we do, and I think after some additional input and surveying and et cetera, but I think whatever we come up with will be or needs to be transparent and be viewed as somewhat transitional. I hope we get it largely right but it would be imperfect, I think everybody up here knows that, and I would suggest that we invoke some kind of committee for monitoring evaluation and that we come together at the next retreat, whenever that might be, maybe the year after we invoke the new model, and do something like this again, have honest feedback from a broad cross section of people who have been engaged and find out how good it really is and tweak it, tweak it thereafter.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Thank you. Who else would like to share your thoughts. Gene?

MR. BLOCK: I think although there is a fairly large standard deviation of views expressed in the room, as any room of full people, there was some clearly theme emerging and I think consistent with the way we're thinking. I think everyone agrees presidents have to have the ultimate authority on issues that involve our student-athletes and we all agree that athletic directors and others are absolutely essential in this process. We have to find a way to engage them more meaningfully in the NCAA. I think overall on the big issues I see agreement, so I'm optimistic that we can actually take your advice and come up with a coherent and hopefully productive new model for the organization.

MR. DRAKE: I think it's been very, very helpful. I think to associate with Gene's point, I think that overwhelmingly there's large agreement in the room on many things. I think we here agree on those things as well. There were some areas where we had views where we might have been thinking one way where the room might seemed to be thinking in another way. I think that's a great stimulus for us to go back and rethink that. I've been very engaged on the level of engagement that we've heard and the opinions. Also, as I mentioned yesterday, the group of people expressing those opinions, I believe that leads us to believe there is quite a bit of common ground and gives us something to aim for.

MS. CHENG: I think we all came together in a core value of student welfare and that some themes of leading to restored trust through a competency-based model, a more simplified structure that engages everyone; however, we don't have a one size fits all need for the organization and it's a very diverse group of institutions. But I do believe that the spirit here, really re-enforces if there's a will we can get this done.

MR LEEBRON: Sort of echo what I said before. This has been from my perspective incredibly helpful. I would probably divide the comments into two categories. I think there's one group of comments

where people have sort of concretely disagreed with some aspects of what we've called the straw model. At the end of the day we have to come to some decisions and folks may still disagree with those aspects of the model. This isn't just a theoretical exercise, it's also a practical and political exercise. I think we need to be a little realistic about that. Then I think there's really a larger group of comments where lots of things have not been specified and some things we ran out of time and some things we probably didn't spend the time we should have. I think the comments made about exactly what is the role and vision for students in this process, it's not that we didn't envision a role but we failed to explicitly say what that role is and that's part of our assignment going back. So I think we have to take both of those kinds of things where we spend a lot of time in disagreement with what we did and how we factor that in, and where were the things that we failed to inadequately specify and discuss and we have to go back and in the next iteration make sure we have those. But I would say this, I think, has produced the kind of information that was exactly what we were looking for and I think as others have said it's not really just about the voting but I think about understanding what the reasons are and what the passions are and figuring out how to incorporate that into work going forward.

MR. PASTIDES: One other thing that occurred to me during the hours spent together is that we need to focus on efficiency. One question exposed to me and to us the fact that nobody in this room feels that the external world, external to us, will hear deeply about what we've done here and will be unduly influenced in a positive way that we're a better organization. That will happen when we do the things that we have to do. So this is fundamentally about a better method of governance, transparency, higher quality, but we've got a lot of other work to do beyond this. So I'm going to as we go forward try not to bog down not believing that this is the end all to be all of the NCAA. It's a step forward toward better and more efficient governance.

MR. SCHULZ: I really have four things. First, I think it's incumbent upon us sitting up here to take the variety of viewpoints that we've heard and try and modify the proposal, the model, to make sure that we're meeting the needs as expressed to us today. Secondly, we want to ask everybody in the room to keep the advice, the critique coming towards the subcommittee. I think this is really important and as we go through the process we need to hear, via E-mail, social media, letters, personal conversations involving engagement this way is important. Third, as academics sometimes we want to continue to modify new data. At some point we've got to get our 90 percent solution and implement it and not keep arguing and debating endlessly. We have to reach a point where we say this is what we're going to do and move forward. Finally, sometimes we always think when we do these things whatever model we come up with has got to be that way for a decade. If after a year we find some things that are not working, we've talked about this, we need to go back and continue to tweak and modify, so it doesn't have to be forever.

MR. EMMERT: Just that this was billed as and structured as a dialogue among all of you. We set this up about six months ago or so, invited a group of people to come to San Diego in the middle of the winter and to have a structured conversation about some very complicated issues. The first aspiration I had, I'll confess, was pretty modest was that people would show up and you all did. And then second was that we would have the ability to have a really good robust conversation that the Steering Committee and everyone here could learn from, and I think you've been very successful in that regard. This is a windowing process. It's taking a lot of big complicated ideas and sifting down through them and finding commonality of interests and structures that may well work and then, as we just stated, finding that 90 percent or so solution that you can all adopt and feel good about. While there's still a lot of things to be resolved I dare say that nine months ago a number of the things that you all just said you seemed to agree on, you never would have said. You have moved a long way towards commonality of interests with each other and I think that's something very commendable. We have a ways to go yet, obviously, and I know these folks to my right are going to work very hard to listen closely to what you have to say, so thank you very much.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: President Hatch?

MR. HATCH: Let me join my colleagues in thanking all of you for your substantive participation. It's been enormously useful to us and let me say something about the process moving forward. The next two months we will be very active. We already have our own personal meetings setting for February and we will continue to craft this model. I think the plan would be by the April meeting to have an additional model which would be shared with the membership. There are a lot of meetings of athletic directors, of conferences in the spring. I think that would be a good time for continued discussion and hopefully we can get this wrapped up and approved by the summer. That's our goal of the full committee. So, again, let me thank all of you. Let me thank the NCAA staff and please join me for thanking Jean Frankel.

MODERATOR FRANKEL: Thank you. With that we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

FRIDAY SESSION

JANUARY 17, 2014

(The Division III Issues Forum of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held at the San Diego Convention Center, San Diego, California, on Friday, January 17, 2014, was called to order at 8:00 o'clock a.m., with Division III Presidents Council Chairman Jack Ohle presiding.)

Chairman Ohle: Good morning. Welcome to the Division III Issues Forum. Most of you have probably seen me at a podium at one time or another throughout the years, and last night at the Business Session, but for those who have not, I am Jack Ohle. I am president of Gustavus Adolphus College and most honored to be chair of the Division III Presidents Council. It is my responsibility as chair of the Council to chair today's forum. Joining me on the dais today, this morning from the Division III Governance Structure, and I want to introduce them, are very important people for who we are. Sharon Hertzberger, Dr. Hertzberger is President of Whitter College who also serves as vice chair of the President's Council, and chair elect. Sharon is right here to my left. *(Applause)*

Terry Rupert, right here to my left, is the director of athletics at the Wilmington College of Ohio. He has got me trained, and chair of the Management Council. For those of you who are new, the Management Council really does the hard lifting and so Terry has been the chair of that for two years now and has done a fantastic job. All of the members of the Management Council who work with him deserve a great deal of support from us. So, let's thank Terry and the members of the Council. *(Applause)*

Now, the people that really get the work done are people like Dan Dutcher, who is the vice president for Division III. Dan is no stranger to any of us and just does a fantastic job. Dan, thank you for all that you do. *(Applause)*

Louise McCleary, director of Division III, this is your third year -- second year? Boy, I am speeding that up, aren't I? She is doing a fantastic job as director. Let me introduce the other two and then we will clap for all three of them. Jeff Myers, director of academic and membership affairs for the Division and Brandy Hataway, who you will be hearing from Jeff and Brandy quite a bit on the legislation. Brandy serves as the associate director of academic and membership affairs for Division III. Let's welcome them. *(Applause)*

Now, we are also joined by Georgana Taggart, Director of Paralegal Studies and faculty athletics representative at the College of Mount Saint Joseph, who serves as our Parliamentarian. *(Applause)*

Additional membership representatives and staff will be joining us throughout the day here, during the course of the morning and during the course of our program. Today is going to be an exciting day. We are going to deal with a lot of good issues, give you a chance to really engage in conversation, give us feedback on what you are doing and that will help us a great deal. Finally, a court reporter is present always here to help us create an accurate record of our meetings. So, please remember to give your name and your school and your conference affiliation when you speak from a microphone today. I would also like to ask a favor. I do it all the time and I better check mine. Let's check our cell phones and make sure they are on mute, and mine isn't. I just reminded myself. So, please shut them off or set them on the silent or vibrate mode and we will be better off for all of us. Our agenda this morning is divided into three sections. First, Jeff and Brandy will lead a review of the legislative proposals we will consider during tomorrow's Business Session. We have reserved about 25 minutes for that presentation. Second, we will receive an update from the Recruiting Working Group. They have been doing fantastic work. If you will remember, last year at this Convention, was the first report from that group. It gave us an opportunity to start thinking about this whole recruiting in Division III and how important that is. So, I am looking forward to that report myself. The group has accomplished a lot. The Recruiting Working members will summarize recent survey results and discussions and present nine proposed concepts for us to think about and to discuss at our tables today.

You will also have the opportunity for electronic feedback to help guide the Recruiting Working Group in their discussions. We have allotted about two hours for those three discussions. Last, we will conclude two or three town hall sessions over our remaining approximately 45 minutes. You will have the opportunity to hear about it, discuss and provide electronic feedback on several hot topics, if you will, of interest during the town hall sessions. So, sit back, relax and enjoy because you are going to be helping all the divisions in the comments you will be making at your tables. You will get to know each other and have the opportunity to be a big part of this Issues Session today. Again, this year, in attempt to limit the handouts, all of the information covered in this session, including the PowerPoint presentation is available on the Division III web page at ncaa.org.

In addition, please note that wireless internet access is available in the room, and the password information is listed in the program as well as posted on the signage in the room. We are scheduled to adjourn at 11:30 a.m. We will make that schedule, and we have not scheduled a formal break. Now, for some of us, we may have to take a break. Please do, but try to have minimum breaks so you can stay involved in the conversation. Let's look at the legislative review. I would like to now transfer to two very important people that I introduced earlier and that is Jeff and Brandy. They will present the information and Georgana is ready to assist with any parliamentary help for the discussion on the legislation. Dan has asked me, and I didn't have it in my notes, that Dr. Brian Hainline is here. He will be joining us, our chief medical officer, to help with the discussion. And Naima Stevenson, the NCAA's general counsel, will be here to help us to assist with the health and safety legislative packages also. Thank you. Now, Brandy.

Ms. Hataway: Good morning, everyone. How is everyone doing? Let's get excited for some legislation here. I know I am. This morning is our opportunity to briefly review the proposals that will be voted on in tomorrow's Business Session. There's also the opportunity for you to ask any of those questions that have not already been asked for you. Again, we have a lot of health and safety proposals in front of us today. They have a lot of legal ramifications, things of that nature, so we are very fortunate to have Dr. Hainline and Naima here with us today. Don't hesitate to ask those questions while we have these experts available here with us. As you have been preparing for this Convention and the Business Session tomorrow, there are a number of resources available to you. You have the Convention Official Notice, which is your little green and white booklet that should have been mailed out to all of your institutions. Additionally, there is the interpretive question and answer document that is also available on the ncaa.org Division III homepage. There is a parliamentary procedures document that is kind of a cream off-white color that is in the back of the room on the tables. This is something we always provide to the membership and just probable guidance as to any parliamentary issues or questions we may have received regarding any of the proposals. So, that is in the back of the room for your reference. Additionally, hopefully, you have had the opportunity to look at some of the pre-Convention education videos that we created. Myself, Jeff Myers and Sarah Otey on our staff, did a three-part series. Those are still available. So, if you want to take a look of them when you go back to your rooms tonight you can see us at our best. Before, we begin, let's take a moment on how to read the proposals, and we will kind of go through the order of the Business Session with regards to the legislation. First, in reading the legislation, words in italics or strike throughs, are words that are currently in the legislation that will be removed if the legislation is adopted. Letters and words that are bold-faced and underlined are new. So, those are words that will be added if the proposal is adopted. Then, any letters or texts that are unchanged, that just look normal, how they normally do, those are the ones that all currently in there, and they will not be changing with the adoption of the proposal. I am sorry, our clicker is not working. Let me back up here a little bit. I am sorry about that. The order of the Business Session for the legislative business, first, we will have a motion to accept the Notice and the Program. That is again a little green and white booklet. This involves a couple of things. One is the white pages, which are the current Convention proposals to be voted on tomorrow. That is an opportunity to put those in a different order, so if anyone would like a motion to put those in a different order, that is an opportunity to do that. As well as this is the opportunity to ratify the blue pages that are in the back of that booklet. Those blue page proposals contain non-controversial incorporations, modifications of wording that were adopted over the past year by the governance structure. By a motion of a delegate, any of those can be pulled out for a separate vote. If anyone knows of anything that you are intending to or thinking you might be pulling out for a vote, if you could just let someone on the staff know. What that really does is just kind of eases the session tomorrow so we

are prepared and we have kind of allotted the time to allow for that separate vote as well, and notify our technology people over here so they can be ready as well. After it has finally been approved, then we will have our vote on the white page of the proposals, which are our 10 current proposals that we have. After that concludes, there will be an opportunity for a window of reconsideration. That is generally when we will take a brief break and then everyone can come back and then that is the opportunity to reconsider any other of the proposals that were adopted or not adopted during that previous time.

Let's go ahead and move on. In looking at your first proposal, which is proposal number one. This is the sports safety package. This has an effective date of August 1, 2014, and it is being sponsored by the Presidents Council through the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport. This proposal has three distinct parts. It is the intention during the Business Session, as President Jack Ohle will be the presiding chair during this time period, we will recommend division of the proposal into three distinct subparts for a separate roll call vote by electronic units on each of those subparts. So, that is the intention that while this is one proposal it will be divided on the floor tomorrow or by President Ohle to have a separate vote on those three subparts. So, let's take a look at those three distinct subparts. First is the catastrophic reporting. This piece would require institutions to submit data detailing student-athlete fatalities, near fate fatalities and catastrophic injuries to the NCAA on an annual basis. The second portion is the designation of a team physician. This would require institutions to designate a licensed physician to serve as team physician for its intercollegiate teams. The team physician should be authorized to oversee the medical services for injuries and illnesses incidental to the student-athletes participation. Is it important to note that again, it is just the overseeing of the medical services. It does not specifically detail any duties that are mandated by the team physician. A few requirements for that team physician is that it must be a licensed medical doctor or an osteopathic physician, and he or she must be in good standing to practice medicine in the state of the institution. The final portion of the sports safety package is the CPR, AED, and first aid certification subpart. This would require any coach, who is full-time employed at any institution in any capacity, to maintain current certification in first aid, CPR and AED use.

At this time, do we have any questions regarding Proposal No. 1, and any of its subparts? I just want to remind each one, we do have Dr. Hainline here. I have not seen anyone. *Microphone No. 4.*

Delegate Jay Lemons: I wasn't paying good enough attention, Brandy. I am Jay Lemons, Susquehanna University. I am a member of the Presidents Council. I think it would be very useful and beneficial as the folks understand the legislation before us, to have a chance to hear from Dr. Hainline and his thoughts about these proposals.

Ms. Hataway: Okay.

Dr. Brian Hainline: Well, thank you, and good morning everyone. These proposals came from the Competitive Safeguards Committee. It was actually voted on a month before I came on board in January of last year. They really had to do with trying to ensure just the basic aspects of health and safety at member institutions. The reason why they focused first on catastrophic injury reporting is because it really is critically important for us to understand what happens to student-athletes and who had fatalities or near fatalities in association with sports. The way that this data is obtained now is through newspaper clipping and it is inferential, it is secondary. It is really not a good way to make data-driven decisions. There is a National Center for Catastrophic Injury Reporting, and I have become very engaged with them. Our intent is really to take this data and to really try to understand what it is that brings about the fatalities or near fatalities, and then to make some meaningful changes as a result. Some things we can't prevent, they just happen. But there are other things we can. For example, the whole issue with Rhabdomyolysis, and death from that. There have been many ways that the NCAA has made substantive changes and the incidents of Rhabdomyolysis has gone down. We are just getting a better sense right now of cardiac deaths. I will be happy to report to you, I think, within half a year or a year research that we have on that. I think between that and the Catastrophic Injury Reporting we are going to have a much better understanding of that. The second issue with regard to having a team physician, that really has two parts to it. One is just the very basic aspects of liability. So, in 48 out of 50 states, California and Alaska being the exception, if you're an athletic direc-

tor, the athletic trainer must be under the direct supervision of a physician. Any exception to that is basically in violation to the state law. But more importantly, we are going to be increasingly rolling out the best practices. The way I would like to move in the future is best practices. The best practices set up community standards, and then every member institution can do what it believes is the best for adapting to those community standards. A team physician really needs to have the ultimate authority for directing sports medicine. The team physician should be directing the athletic trainer. The team physician should be in a conflict of interest free environment where he or she can make decisions that are important for the health and well-being of student-athletes, and make important decisions about return to play. ves two functions. One is the state rule function, but more importantly it serves the function of really good medical practice and a conflict of interest free environment. The third proposal that was put forth by the Competitive Safeguards having to do with a coach, a full-time coach being certified in CRP and automatic external defibrillation. That really came about because there were instances of sudden death, actually several instances that occurred in the setting of practice, and it was noted that there were many practices where there was a single coach who was overseeing the practice. It is in those intense practices where an athlete is more at risk, actually at more risk than in a game. In a game there are always more support around. We know that it is really the first two minutes that make a difference when someone has sudden cardiac arrest or really sudden death. With CPR, the way it is conducted today, that really can make a substantive difference. In terms of the burden on a coach, you know, it takes most people about three to four hours to become certified in CPR. It is about a half-day course. It is fairly elementary. It doesn't require detailed medical knowledge. It is something that really provides, I think, very good background for anyone who is involved with intense activity with athletes.

Ms. Hataway: Thank you, Dr. Hainline. Are there any more questions before we move on? Proposal No. 2 reduces the duration of ineligibility for a positive non-performance enhancing drug, or often referred to as a street drug. The effective date on this proposal is August 1, 2014. This proposal is also sponsored by the Presidents Council via the CSMAS. Currently, a student-athlete who tests positive for either a performance enhancing or a street drug is charged with the use of a season of participation, and is ineligible of all regular and postseason competitions for 365 days. A student-athlete remains ineligible until they retest negative, and their eligibility is restored by the Committee on Student-athlete Reinstatement. What this proposal would do is require a student-athlete, who tested positive for a street drug, to be withheld from the next fifty percent of competition, or season of participation, excuse me, competition in all sports. This removes the season of participation penalty. However, it does maintain the requirement for a retest, a negative retest, in that their eligibility must be restored by the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement. Any questions regarding this proposal? Microphone number one.

Delegate Kelly Anderson Diercks: I am Kelly Anderson Diercks, Augsburg College. Brandy, I have not seen anywhere if this would be retroactive. If you have a student on your campus who tests positive, will they get fifty percent of the season back?

Ms. Hataway: That is a good question. Right now, the effective date is August 1, 2014. After the Business Session tomorrow, the Management Council does have the opportunity to go ahead and take a look at that effective date and consider possibly non-controversial legislation to modify that date. Depending on where that date falls or where it happens, there is the waiver process available for any student-athlete that may have kind of fallen based on when a positive test occurred, and then it being adopted, just to kind of help with some of that equity. Right now, it is still August 1st without any retroactive, but that still could possibly change. Another other questions? Okay. Not seeing any, we will go ahead now and move onto the final proposal in the Presidential Grouping. This proposal is sponsored by two of our member conferences, the American Southeast Conference as well as the Southern Athletic Association. The effective date on this proposal, as well, is August 1, 2014, and it deals with the use of helmets during the football strength and conditioning and limited skill instruction period. Under the current legislation, the only permissible equipment during the football spring strength and conditioning and limited skill instruction period is a football and a hand shield. It is important to note that no contact is permitted during this time. Under this proposal, if adopted, it would add a helmet as permissible equipment in addition to the football and the hand shield to be used during this period. However, it is important know that it does still maintain the prohibition on contacts. Are there any questions regarding this proposal?

Delegate Jay Lemons: Brandy, once again, I am Jay Lemons, Susquehanna University, and I would like to ask Dr. Hainline to speak to this and for him to say, if he can, what the research is leaning towards.

Dr. Hainline: Well, there is research and there is consensus. When it comes to concussions and helmets, we primarily are driven by consensus. These are the issues. If you sit with a group of scientists and clinicians, and speak to them about the difference between when someone has a helmet on his or her head and when someone doesn't, and especially with football when he is on the field of football, that the helmet provides a sense of invincibility which is super-imposed on the sensibility that virtually student-athletes have. It has the potential of doing two things. One is that unequivocally it does protect against catastrophic head injuries, especially in regard to skull fractures. It does little to mitigate concussion and sub-concussion acts. One thing it can be used for as a weapon, or actually just to allow gratuitous a head count. In terms of data, actually, I am at a conference next week in Atlanta, and it is an interdisciplinary meeting, and we are going to be presenting data about the hits count, which really is a measure of the number of forces that are either at the concussive or sub-concussive level that occur with full contact practice, or with non-contact practice with the use of helmets and with games. I am not at liberty to actually provide that data until it becomes official next week, but I can tell you, and I am allowed to tell you that the number of head contacts that occur when someone has a helmet in non-contact practice are substantial. So, it is just the nature of the beast. We can't say that that necessarily means there is going to be an adverse health consequence, but then again we are at a place right now with concussion, where I couldn't look at you and say that we even understand the nature history of concussion. There is an awful lot we need to know. We primarily are driven by consensus. The feeling with Competitive Safeguards, they were really in alignment what I just stated with regard when you have a helmet on someone, when you put them on a football field, that the nature of the activity does shift.

Ms. Hataway: Thank you, Dr. Hainline. Any other questions before we move on to Proposal No. 4? Microphone No. 5.

Delegate Scot Dapp: I am Scot Dapp, athletic director at Moravian College. Prior to being the athletic director, I was the head football coach for 24 years. I have also served on the Football Rules Committee, two of those years as chair, the Competitive Safeguards Committee for three years, president of the American Football Coaches Association, and since 1997, although not active, I have been certified by the NATA. So, I can look at this from a lot of different perspectives. My question, when you talk about statistics and studies, how much of that is going to be done by Division III? I know for a fact that so many rules have come into football where changes have been made because of statistics that have taken place in the Division I level and they are not necessarily carried over into our level. The other part is when you start talking about studies with no contact, wearing a helmet in the fall, the helmet only practice in the fall does not necessary carry the in-contact rule. This proposal is the coaches trying to be proactive instead of reactive, and it does, I think, the last line in the slide that is up there right now is important to remember. It does maintain the prohibition on contact. I think that is important. I would suggest that if this rule or this proposal does pass, that we try to keep some statistics during the spring to see on the Division III level, to see if indeed there is any injury of increase of that nature. I have heard people say they are concerned if you put a helmet on, and then the athletic trainer has to be there. My question to those people is why isn't an athletic trainer at these conditioning periods anyway, because they are supposed to be. Thank you.

Dr. Hainline: Now, with regard to the research, the research is coming from Division I schools. It is coming from two schools in particular, and that is what will be presented next week. It is D-I driven research, and we right now don't have D-III driven research on this matter. With regard to having a strictly speaking absolutely no-contact practice and having a football helmet on, if there were certainty there is no contact and someone has a football helmet on, I don't think we have data one way or the other. But if we could be certain of that, then the intent, as I see it, would be that you have a football helmet on to accomplish two things. One is that you become used to wearing a helmet, which is sometimes problematic. At the beginning of the season, we know that helmets come off a lot more than at the end of the season, and it helps mold the helmet to the head, which is another important consideration. So, I really think this has to do with one of the great problems of legislation and that is, you know,

how can we be certain that what we are legislating is being carried out? If we had a reasonable degree of clinical certainty that there is absolutely no contact, is having a helmet on problematic? I don't think so. So, I think that is an issue that really has to -- you know, that gets the devil in the details in these sorts of matters. That sometimes is what happens with all of these legislative issues.

Ms. Hataway: Thank you. Any other questions? I am not seeing anyone. We will go and move on to Proposal No. 4. Proposal No. 4 would amend the first permissible practice and competition date, and establish an acclimatization, with a preseason scrimmage or exhibition in ice hockey. The effective date on this is August 1st. This proposal is being sponsored by 20 of our Division III institutions, as well as it is co-sponsored by the Management Council. Currently, the first permissible practice date is October 15th, with the first permissible contest date including any exhibition or scrimmage, is November 1st. What this proposal would do is move that first permissible practice date to the third Monday of October, and move the contest date to the second Friday following the first permissible practice date. I know that sounds a little complicated, right? When you look at a calendar, it actually flows together pretty well. It was not included in the question and answer document. If you add second addition, as well as the intent, if adopted, these dates will be included within the Division III Manual. So, if you take a look in the current Q&A you can kind of get a glimpse of what those dates look like as well as if adopted this will be included in the NCAA Manual. Additionally, this proposal would also allow one scrimmage or exhibition or joint practice prior to the first permissible contest date. So, this is a six digit shift from what the current legislation is. However, it is important to note that this proposal also requires that each student-athlete participate in a minimum of five on ice practices before any contest. That is including the exhibition or scrimmage. That is counted by each individual student-athlete. So, that is that five-day acclimatization period. Are there any question regarding this proposal? I am not seeing any. We will move on to Proposal No. 5. That modifies the number of permissible exhibitions and scrimmages for the preseason in field hockey. This is sponsored by the State University of New York Athletic Conference as well as the Liberty League. This has an effective date of August 1, 2014. Currently, field hockey permits an unlimited number of exhibitions or scrimmages on one date often referred to as the play date, or an unlimited play date. This date does count within the maximum 20 contest limitations for field hockey. What this proposal would do really kind of line up field hockey to look similar to what soccer currently has. It would allow for up to three scrimmage or exhibition games prior to the first permissible contest, all of which must count within the maximum permissible contest. One of those three could still be an unlimited play date, so you could still have the unlimited play date, but it will have to count as one of your three. Are there any questions regarding this proposal? Okay. Let's move to Proposal No. 6. This deals with limits on scouting and exhibition contests. It is sponsored by the Division III Management Council. It has an effective date of August 1, 2014. Currently, institutions may permissibly scout a future opponents at exhibitions, regular and postseason competition, but not scrimmages. If adopted, this proposal would permit scouting only at regular season and postseason exhibitions. So, scouting, in exhibitions, would no longer be permitted. Are there any questions regarding this proposal? Microphone No. 4.

Delegate Lex McMillan: Lex McMillan, Albright College. Can you just refresh my memory on how this is envisioned to be enforced?

Ms. Hataway: How would the envision be enforced?

Delegate Lex McMillan: What is the envision for enforcement? How would it work practically?

Ms. Hataway: Well, I think right now it is up to the institutions. It would be up to you knowing what your coaches are going to and where they are scouting at. This would still allow scouting through video means as well, so that still is available. But this really would kind of come down to the institutions knowing where your coaches are and what they are going to I suppose in addition as well, those institutions that may have coaches attending their events that is something that you might have a coach somewhere they are not supposed to be, and you might want to have a conversation with them or talk to that person. I think it comes down, you know, institutional education of your coaches and making sure they know what they can attend. Any other questions? We will move to Proposal

No. 7. This addresses waivers of sports sponsorship for single gender institution transitioning to coeducational. Now, the effective date is August 1st, 2014. This is sponsored by the Management Council. Currently, there is no limit on the number of minimum sports sponsorship waivers that an institution may receive that is transitioning from a single gender to a coeducational. These waivers are granted for a three-year period. What the proposal would do would be limiting those three-year waivers to no more than two, so that the waivers would still be good for three years, but an institution would be permitted to request no more than two of those waivers for a total of a six-year waiver period. Any questions regarding this proposal? Proposal No. 8 deals with women's rugby and the dates of competition. The effective date on this one is August 1st, 2014, and is also sponsored by the Management Council. Under the current legislation, an institution may participate in a maximum of 10 contests outside competition during the institution's playing season. Currently, competition of rugby is played in a 15-a-side format. The change would do for this proposal, if adopted, would change that maximum contests limitation to 15. The dates of competition, rather than the 10 contests. This would help to accommodate the seven-a-side competition, which is going to be played in the Olympics. So, it provides a little more flexibility for the sport. Additionally, it has a couple of changes to the minimum contest requirements. It would allow an institution to count either 15-a-side or seven-a-side competition in satisfying those requirements. It would also allow an institution to count two contests per year against a four-year collegiate club team toward meeting those minimum contest requirements. Are there any other questions on this proposal? I am not seeing any. Proposal No. 9 deals with women's triathlon as an emerging sport for women. The effective date on this is August 1st, 2014. This is being sponsored by the Management Council and the Committee on Women's Athletics. This proposal would add triathlon as a new emerging sport for women and establish all the legislation relating to amateurism, the playing of practice seasons, and the membership requirements to sponsor this sport. Are there any questions on this proposal? Microphone No. 9.

Delegate Kris Hall: I am Kris Hall, director of athletics, Barnard College, and a member of the Liberty League. I have just a question about the possible conflict that triathlon would impose on the sports of women's cross country and women's swimming. I am curious about those committees' positions on the addition of women's triathlon as an emerging sport.

Ms. Hataway: You are correct, that the women's triathlon championship segment, the way it is drafted is to be a fall sport. So, it would be a fall championship sport. I don't know that there was any comment from either of those specific sports committees, cross country, or I think you said swimming and diving, as it relates to that. I think a lot of the thought is also that these would be different student-athletes necessarily. I mean they may have student-athletes who choose to participate in both, but it would be a separate team.

Delegate Kris Hall: I think we do realize that, but I am hearing some commentary from the membership that there could be or would be a draw from those sports into the triathlon, and that they impact sponsorships in those programs. Would it be possible for us to have committee positions available to us tomorrow prior to voting on this?

Ms. Hataway: I am not sure we can do that. We will probably not have time to pull those committees together. Thank you. Microphone No. 6.

Delegate Debbie Warren: Good morning. My name is Debbie Warren. I am the director of athletics at Marymount University. We do offer triathlon, and it is a growing youth sport. The kids are coming to us already, biking, swimming and running, which are life-time activities, and we have not had a conflict of interest with our cross country and swimming programs. Some of the student-athletes will be going into swimming because they can, but not all. So, I just want to put forth that it has not been a conflict for us. It brings a wonderful student to our campus that might not already be there, and I ask for your support. Thank you.

Ms. Hataway: Okay. Are there any other questions?

Delegate Dean Snyder: I am Dean Snyder, Whitman College, and also a member of the Committee on

Women's Athletics. I would be glad to speak for the Committee on Women's Athletics perspective tomorrow on this issue.

Ms. Hataway: Any questions? Okay. We will go ahead and move to our final proposal. This is Resolution No. 10. The effective date on this one is immediate. The sponsors for this are the Allegany Mountain Collegiate Conference, the Commonwealth Coast Conference, the North Coast Athletic Conference, and the Empire Eight. A little bit of background kind of where we are right now. The Playing Rules Oversight Panel oversees all NCAA rules committees. This includes approving any types of recommendations or any other issues that deal with the playing rules. Specifically, these could include rules that address finances, safety, image of the games typically need to be uniform across the divisions. Additionally, the PROP, the acronym that you will hear people will use a lot for this, the Playing Rules Oversight Panel does not report to any divisional authority. They actually report directly to the Executive Committee. So, no division necessarily has the authority to review or -- excuse me. They don't have the authority to review or act on any request from any division to exempt it from delaying implementation of a playing rule. So, again, the oversight is to the Executive Committee. What this would do, this resolution would do is just urges PROP to institute a policy that any playing rule that is going to change, have an facility impact or financial impact, that that rule change would have a minimum of one-year delay implementation, and it would not restrict an institution from hosting any type of NCAA championship or any type of related event during this time of delay. However, with the caveat that any approved rule change that would directly and significantly enhance student-athlete safety maybe enacted immediately. So, it has kind of got that immediate safety kind of fixed there in case there are any of those types of issues. It really is a resolution. This would not be binding legislation. This is something that would appear in the Manual. This is an opportunity for the Division to kind of come together and express your message to PROP. Are there any questions regarding the resolution? That is all. Thank you.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you very much, Brandy. That was very helpful and certainly there will be opportunities through the rest of this day and tomorrow morning again when we get into the legislation to ask questions. As you know, we always provide an opportunity for everyone to be heard. Between the question and the answer documents that you have received and the online video presentations and now this session, we hope that you are now prepared for a good legislative discussion later as we get into the conference meetings this afternoon. You will have an opportunity to discuss these with your conferences and decide how the conference office will be voting as well as how each of you will be voting in those particular cases. We will next take up our conversation regarding the recruiting in Division III and the related effects of our Recruiting Working Group. We will engage you in a round-table discussion with specific questions regarding the important topic as well as doing some straw-poll voting on some of the concepts. Before we get started, each of you should have picked up the electronic voting unit when you entered the meeting room. I hope if you have not, please go ahead and go over to the area where the voting machines are and make sure you have one. As second piece of information, I see some chairs that have been lined up around the back where individuals have been seated, there are a number of tables up here where you can sit and be involved in the discussions. We would encourage you to do that, and hope that would be helpful to the people at the tables as well as helpful to you. You will use the voting machine, if you have it, and the unit will respond to our straw-poll questions, and we can see the totals displayed on the video screens. The straw-poll voting is anonymous. The machines are not recorded for any individual, and does not reflect the binding resolution. Instead, it will be used to gauge where the membership is today on the various topics and to advise the Working Group and the Governance Structure on how to best move forward. We will use the same type of voting units during tomorrow's Business Session. However, unlike tomorrow's voting today will not be limited to one per person or member institution. Again, the voting will be anonymous, so you should not insert the voting card that you have if you are representing your institution today. That's for tomorrow. I would like to briefly remind you of a few key points regarding the voting systems. The units are very easy to use. You do not need to turn the units on or off. They are always ready to transmit and there is no antenna that you need to look for to pull out. When I declare that it is time to vote, simply press the button for your selection. The number you choose will appear in the L.E.D. window on the front of the keypad. It will only appear for a moment or two, and will go out when your vote has been received by the system. If any item, other than the number you pressed, appears on the L.E.D. window, please notify one of the voting technicians immediately, and there table is located here by the head table to my right. The keypads

will accept votes until the polls are declared closed. So, if you press the wrong voting number, simply enter the correct vote that you would like to give, and that will change until the machines are closed. You will have about 30 seconds during that voting period to do that. After the polling stops, the summary results for each electronic vote will be displayed on the large projection screens, and we will have an opportunity to discuss that briefly and give you the results, and we will move on from there. Finally, remember to leave the voting unit at your seat; you don't even need to take it back to the unit area. If you happen to take the keypad with you, please return it promptly to the registration area or contact an NCAA staff member here in the ballroom and they will make arrangements to pick it up. Are there any questions about the voting machines? We have now had these for a couple of years, and it is important that we go over these so everyone knows how to use them. Today will be a good opportunity to get ready for our Business Session tomorrow. If that is the case, let's start with the test. Remember "1" is for yes. It is pretty simple. "2" is for no, and "3" is to abstain. That is 1, 2, 3.

The first question, is the ncaa.org web site easier to navigate? Press "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. All right. The results are in. We have a little more work to do on the web site. That is why we ask these questions, right? Thank you for your response. Yes, thirty-six percent; no, forty percent and abstain twenty-four percent. If you abstained because you haven't used it, get on the site and you can help us out. If anyone believes their unit did not work, please have someone over at the table look at your machine, and they will help you with that. A representative from the Governance Structure or staff has been placed at each table today, now to facilitate the discussion and take notes that will be forwarded back to the Governance Structure as we go through this opportunity to have discussion. If you are sitting at a table without a facilitator, please move to another table close to you. And for those, as I said earlier that only have one or two at a table, please join in with another table to fill that table up. Also, when any table facilitator that doesn't have a packet of information at their table, please raise your hand and one of the staff members will make sure you get the materials so that you can lead the discussion. Is there anybody that does not have the materials? I would now like to introduce several members of the Recruiting Working Group, who will help lead this discussion. First, David Ellis, senior vice president and chief financial officer of Becker College who is the co-chair of the Working Group. Karen Tessmer, the associate athletics director and compliance officer and head women's basketball coach at Worcester State University. Did I pronounce that right? You know, I was in Ohio for a number of years and it was "Wooster". Did I get in close? Thank you. I apologize. Barney Forsythe, president of Westminster College. Keri Luchowski, who is the executive director for the North Coast Athletic Conference. And Mike Mattia, who is the senior associate director of athletics and senior compliance administrator at John Hopkins University. David, I would like you to start.

Delegate David Ellis: Good morning. I am David Ellis. Like Karen, I am also from Worcester, Massachusetts. I am one of the co-chairs of the Recruiting Group and it didn't work last year, but I will try it again, go Patriots all the way. During the next two hours, we will present the Working Group's work since the 2013 Convention, and seek your feedback and suggestions. Our Recruiting Group is really looking for you to give us some clear direction. Let me give you a quick recap of our work since the 2012 Convention, where in a D-III sponsored educational session suggested that we as a membership should work closely to examine the recruiting championships, the use of sports culture and the impact on work life-balance of coaches, particular women. A survey of Division III administrators and coaches in April 2012, was 550 plus respondents indicating that 45 percent would like to examine our current recruiting policies and procedures. As a result, in July 2012, the Division III Governance Structure formed the 14-member Recruiting Working Group. At last year's Convention, we engaged the membership in roundtable discussions and straw-poll voting. The consensus was, and we thank you, that the Recruiting Working Group should continue its work. Since last year's Convention we have continued to engage the membership. In April 2013, a survey was sent to all coaches and over 2,000 completed the survey and provided feedback. The Working Group also reviewed the February 2013 Membership Like Survey and the particular the questions specific to recruiting. The Working Group conducted teleconference calls with nine national governing bodies and engaged our Division III commissioners to gain greater feedback and insight. During our summer 2013, in-person meeting, the Recruiting Working Group analyzed all of the data and as a result developed nine concepts for membership review and feedback. The Recruiting Working Group initially assessed each proposed concept with the following questions and parameters in mind. One, how would the concept impact the

student-athlete experience, both prospective and current student-athletes? Two, would there be a financial burden to implement the concepts with the understanding that many Division III institutions have smaller budgets and a limited amount of resources? Three, does the concept add to the workload of compliance officers, and would it create additional monitoring requirements? Four, does the concept aid or deter a coach's work life balance? Five, would there be a negative impact on enrollment management over the past five years? We have seen more and more athletics department become an important extension of the admissions operations, and a vital role in the institution's enrollment management and retention of student's strategy. Lastly, does the proposed concept align with our division's philosophy? This fall, a web-based survey was sent to the membership to obtain feedback on the nine concepts. All constituent groups were targeted. Over 2,300, an excellent response, completed the survey, which represented 70 percent of the respondents were actually coaches. While coaches made up the majority, responses were largely aligned with the other constituent groups, presidents and chancellors, athletic direct repots, assistant athletic directors, FARs, and other athletic personnel. The survey findings were released to the membership in early December, and a link to the findings was included in the Issue Forum materials distributed within the past two weeks. We hope you had the opportunity to look these over. So, over the next two hours we will have the following format. We will provide a brief summary on three concepts where a consensus opinion from the most recent survey was apparent to our group. For the remaining six concepts we will also provide a brief summary on each concept, and we will engage in round table discussions with time for open-mic feedback on three of the concepts. For the other three, there will only be straw-poll questions and no roundtable discussion. The Working Group thought long about this format and we believe it will allow us to reach our central goal for today, to cover on-line concepts and to receive clear direction from you, the membership, especially regarding the concepts in which there seems to be a greater desire for additional discussion. There are several possible next steps for our group. One is to develop legislation for 2015, a second might to develop best practices, and another option to conduct further research and examination, and then finally no longer discuss the proposed concept. So, we need your help, and with that let's get started. Of the nine proposed concepts, the concept of enhancing education and promotion of the division garnered the most support. The concept's goal is to take the educational value of the Division III identity initiative to another level, a level that goes beyond our campuses and conference offices and includes prospective student-athletes and their parents and guardians, and club and high school coaches and high school guidance counselors. There was broad support for the concept. There were more than eighty five percent of the respondents in each constituent group supporting the concept. Over the course of the next year, the Working Group will explore the best means to promote Division III at the high school and club levels. The next concept that we will summarize centers on off-campus visits and specifically prohibiting coaches from conducting in-home visits with prospective student-athletes. Our current Division III Bylaws allow off-campus contact after the completion of a prospective student-athlete's junior year, and there is no restriction as to where that off-campus contact may occur. An earlier survey of Division III coaches showed that only 18 percent of the coaches currently conduct in-home visits, primarily in football and men's basketball. However, while many coaches may not conduct in-home visits, overall fifty-five percent of the respondents to the latest survey are opposed to a prohibition, and an even higher percentage, sixty five percent, thought this restriction would put Division III at a disadvantage in regard to Divisions I and II. For the minority that supported the prohibition of in-home visits, they cited that the prohibition would help alleviate the stress of recruiting schedules and budgets, and help promote a better work/life balance for coaches. Since the prohibition of in-home visits was one of the concepts to receive the lowest level of support, the Recruiting Working Group does not intend to have further conversations regarding this topic.

The third I will talk about is the proposed requirement to have all prospective student-athletes register with the Eligibility Center, and it received rather mixed support. Currently, Divisions I and II have this requirement, and the Eligibility Center certifies the academic eligibility and amateurism of prospects based on the legislative standards adopted by those divisions. In Division III, the initial academic eligibility standards applicable to each student-athlete are a matter of institutional and conference autonomy consistent with the Division III philosophy statement. And similarly to the other divisions, only an amateur student-athlete is eligible for intercollegiate athletics participation in a particular sport, and certification is done by institutional and conference compliance officers. While fifty-six percent opposed, thirteen percent indicated that they needed more information. The high-

est percentage where that happened of the nine concepts. The survey results also noted slightly under half of the respondents did not believe registering with the Eligibility Center would impact enrollment management. A similar percentage said that this concept would be a negative impact on prospective student-athletes and compliance officers. The only clear consensus, eighty-one percent, said that the registration fee would be a burdensome issue, for prospective student-athletes. Due to the lack of consensus in support or opposition, the Recruiting Working Group does not anticipate continuing to research or discuss this topic absent clear and significant interest from the membership. With approximately 90 minutes left in the session, I want to focus on the remaining six concepts, and will engage the membership audience in roundtable discussions and straw-pole voting with the goal of getting as clear a sense from you as possible. There will also be an opportunity for open mic feedback after much round table discussion. So, now, at this point it is with great pleasure that I introduce our Working Group co-chair, also from Worcester, Massachusetts, Karen Tessmer. (*Applause*)

Delegate Karen Tessmer: Thank you. I am Karen Tessmer, Head Women's Basketball coach, Associate Athletic Director and Compliance Officer at Worcester State University in Massachusetts, and go Patriots. We are certainly looking forward to our discussion today and appreciate your feedback as we try to make progress to the challenging world of recruiting. Our first round table discussion will focus on the concept of allowing on-campus evaluations. This concept would permit institutions to conduct evaluations of prospective student-athletes on campus or at sites where institutions normally conduct practices or competition. Currently, it is impermissible for an athletics department coaching staff to observe or conduct physical workouts or other recreational activities designed to test the athletics ability of prospective student-athletes. In the most recent survey, there were several conditions cited as initial perimeters for the campus evaluations. In the round table discussion, our goal is to get a clear picture of how this concept and the parameters would be developed, especially if the membership wanted further proposed legislation. The survey results indicated that 66 percent of the respondents supported the concept with a high of 70 percent from coaches. The survey respondents had a similar level of support the on-campus evaluations, which would have a positive impact on enrollment management and prospective student-athletes. An earlier survey of Division III coaches showed that more than two-thirds of coaches attended off-campus recruiting events. This same survey indicated that permitting on-campus evaluations could enhance the relationship building aspect of recruiting while allowing coaches to refrain from attending so many off-campus events. On-campus evaluations would also allow for part-time coaches to be better integrated into the recruiting process, allow coaches and prospective student-athletes to more accurately identify a good institutional fit, and potentially allow coaches to travel off-campus less. Additionally, this less travel by coaches could result in a financial benefit for the institutions. The most recent survey asked one specific question regarding one of the parameters, the appropriate age for prospective student-athletes to attend. The responses were even divided. Forty-eight percent said juniors should be allowed to participate, and 50 percent said only seniors should participate in on-campus evaluations. We want each table to examine this and the other parameters of this concept and provide specific feedback and guidance. Those parameters include the appropriate age of the participants, the timing, when should an on-campus evaluation be allowed to happen. The number of on-campus evaluations per prospective student-athlete sport and/or institution, and participation with current student-athletes. Before we begin the roundtable discussions, we would like to get a better feel for which constituents are in the room. At this time, we ask you to use your voting units to answer the following question. So, pull those units out. What is your primary position at your institution? Press "1" for president; "2" for athletic director; "3" for director of compliance, "4" for associate or assistant director of athletics; "5" for commissioner; "6" for faculty athletic rep; "7" for coach; "8" for student-athlete and "9" for other. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. And the results. All right, thank you.

The roundtable questions are at your table as well as on the screens in front of the room. The facilitators have additional information on each concept. Please use the next 10 minutes to discuss these questions. At the conclusion of the 10 minutes we will have an open mic session for immediate feedback and questions. You may now break for your round table discussions. (*Recess.*)

Delegate Karen Tessmer: At this time, are there any questions, comments or feedbacks? If so, please come up to the microphone and identify yourselves and we will go from there. It sounds like we had good conversations,

so, thank you. Any comments, questions or feedbacks? Microphone No. 9.

Delegate Dana Harmon: Hi, Karen. I am Dana Harmon, Worcester Polytechnic Institute. The Worcester contention here. Just a check question on the liability piece. Health clearance, we have to clear all our own student-athletes, but we were wondering how this is handled at Division II with 16 to 17 year old in their health clearance. Thanks.

Delegate Karen Tessmer: That is one of the decisions that will need to be made. Division II does have some liability waiver sign-offs. We would have to consider that as part or some of the parameters. Hopefully, we get some discussion about the use of current student-athletes. I don't know if anyone from the NCAA wishes to make any comments. It is all part of the discussion and duly noted, and put in there the liability for current athletes as well as PSAs who will be attending. Thank you.

Any other comments or feedbacks? All right. Great. Thank you. Our next concept off-campus recruiting models will be presented with a brief summary and several straw-poll questions, there will be no roundtable discussion for this concept. The recent survey presented responded to three potential off-campus models: Quiet periods, limitations on recruiting and non-scholastic events during the academic year, and sports specific recruiting calendars. Currently, Division III does not impose restrictions on the time or the number of off-campus evaluations activities. Overall fifty six percent of the respondents opposed any new limitations with coaches having the highest percentage of opposition at sixty percent. Of the thirty seven percent who did support some form of limitations, both quiet periods and sport specific recruiting calendars were supported at a higher rate than limitations on non-scholastic during the academic year. Since 2012 and over the course of three surveys, only forty percent of the membership expressed consistent support for establishing off-campus recruiting limitations. The Recruiting Working Group believes this indicates that it should not further develop any off-campus limitation models. However, the forty percent represents a sizable portion of our membership. Consequently, the responses to the following questions will be made available to all coaching associations NADIAA, NACWAA and other organizations that have indicated a level of interest in this concept. While the Recruiting Working Group will not be discussing this concept further, your responses today will be beneficial for all other organizations who may want to further explore and develop this concept. The central themes related to off-campus recruiting regulations, as gleaned from the latest survey, were the following: Lack of recruiting autonomy. The changing of the recruiting landscape. For example, the explosion of youth sports and its impact, both positive or negative on a coach's work life balance. Increase burden on compliance officers and enrollment management. We want to know how important each of these things are in formulating your opinion on the concept of further regulating off-campus recruiting. This time we will be asking several straw-poll votes. The first straw-poll question is; off-campus regulations may threaten the autonomy that Division III schools currently have in recruiting especially as compared to Division's I and II. How does this impact your thinking on the concept of off-campus regulations? Press "1" for this is not a concern for me. Press "2" for this leads me to oppose any limitations on off-campus recruiting. And press "3" for I have concerns related to this, that this should not hold us back from exploring limitations. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. We have fifteen percent that says this is not a concern for me. Forty-one percent, this leads me to oppose any limitations on off-campus recruiting, and forty-four percent, I have concerns related to this, this should not hold us back for exploring limitations. The next straw-poll question is off-campus regulations, even modest ones, may address the changing recruiting landscape our coaches face. This landscape is marked by the explosion of youth sports and the subsequent pressure to fill roster spots on teams, and the pressures on coaches to balance the 12-month recruiting cycle with commitments on campus and at home. How does this impact your thinking on the concept of off-campus regulations? Press "1" for this is not a concern for me. Press "2" for this leads me to oppose any limitations on off-campus recruiting. Press "3" for I have concerns related to this, but this should not hold us back from exploring limitations. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. Thirteen percent is not a concern for me. Twenty-nine percent this leads me to oppose any limitations on off-campus recruiting. Fifty-eight percent I have concerns related to this, but this should not hold us back from exploring limitations. Thank you. The third poll question is: off-campus regulations in the related administrative work load may result in an additional burden on compliance officers and coaches, especially in departments where staff members wear

multiple hats. How does this impact your thinking on the concept of off-campus regulations?

Press “1” for this is not a concern for me. Press “2” for this leads me to oppose any limitations on off-campus recruiting. Press “3” for I have concerns related to this and this should not hold us back from exploring limitations. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. Thirteen percent, this is not a concern for me. Thirty-eight percent, this leads me to oppose any limitations on off-campus recruiting. And forty- nine percent, I have concerns related to this, but this should not hold us back from exploring limitations. Thank you.

The final straw-poll question is: Off-campus regulations, even modest ones, may have negative impact on a school’s ability to meet its enrollment goals. How does this impact your thinking on the concept of off-campus regulations? Press “1” for this is not a concern for me. Press “2” for this leads me to oppose any limitations on off-campus recruiting. Press “3” for I have concerns related to this and this should not hold us back from exploring limitations. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. Twenty-six percent it is not a concern for me. Thirty-eight percent, this leads me to oppose any limitations on off-campus recruiting. Thirty-six percent, I have concerns related to it but this shouldn’t hold us back in exploring limitations. Thank you for the feedback on some difficult questions for sure. I would like to turn the next concepts over to my colleague, Mike Mattia, and we will continue to proceed with the roundtable discussions and the straw poll. Thank you.

Delegate Mike Mattia: Thank you, Karen. I am Mike Mattia, and I am the Senior Associate Director of Athletics and Senior Compliance AD at John Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland. Unfortunately, we only have about a couple more weeks to celebrate the Super Bowl victory of the Ravens. Our next roundtable discussion will focus on earlier off-campus contact. This concept will allow institutional coaching staff members to have off-campus in-person contact with prospective student-athletes with relatives and guardians at the completion of their sophomore year in high school. The current rule states that a coach may not have in-person, off-campus recruiting contact with the prospective student-athlete or their prospective student-athletes relatives or guardians until the prospective student-athlete has completed his or her junior year in high school. Overall, just over fifty percent of the respondents in the latest survey supported an earlier off-campus contact. However, this concept generated the widest disparity among the respondents. An average of over fifty-three percent of coaches, athletic directors and conference commissioners supported the concept versus a higher average of seventy one percent by presidents, chancellors and athletic direct reports. Conversely, the respondents were in agreement, over eighty percent, that the earlier contact would either have a positive impact or no impact at all on enrollment management. The impact of prospective student-athletes was unclear as a third of the respondents said it would have a negative impact, and just over fifty percent said it would have a positive impact. The discrepancy regarding the concepts overall support may indicate a philosophical divide on the concept that centers on enrollment management needs versus coach workloads. During the next 10 minutes, please discuss the following: Earlier off-campus contact makes recruiting better for you. Is this earlier off-campus contact good for the division? Do you view earlier contact as having a positive or negative impact on coaches? And does this concept have an impact on meeting your institution’s enrollment goals?

Finally, if this concept becomes legislation, what would be the practicable realities for the institution? You have 10 minutes for discussion. (*Recess.*)

Delegate Mike Mattia: At this time we will accept any comments or questions from the floor as you guys finish up your discussion. Are there any comments or questions out there on this concept? Is there anybody that has any questions on this concept? Microphone No. 5.

Delegate Michael McDonough: I am Michael McDonough Southern Vermont College. I would urge the Working Group to be sure to take into account the impacts on the prospective student-athletes in this regard, particularly with the age question. As a former men’s basketball coach, I always had concern about the impact of my presence at a high school game was having on the athletes, and the extension of that impact from this senior year to the junior year needs to be taken into consideration. I again was disappointed that the questions we were asked to form at the table did not take that impact into account. Thank you.

Delegate Mike Mattia: Any other question? Any comments? Microphone No. 7.

SAAC Member Eddie Trio: My name is Eddie Trio from Pacific University. I am the SAAC president of student-athletes. I just want to make a quick comment that we talked about at our table. We looked at the impact that it might have on a student freshman or sophomore, those being contacted to play at a university. What I said was my perspective was when I was a freshman and a sophomore, I had so much more on my mind then where I wanted to go to school in two years. I was more concerned about, you know, if the girl in my math class would want to go to homecoming with me than where I was going to go to school in a couple of years. Tried to kind of start earlier in recruiting students and adding that burden on to them when they are freshman and sophomores at a crucial point in their career in high school, they start to learn about themselves and find themselves doesn't seem very fair to me. If we were to start contacting them earlier, maybe the junior year, maybe the second semester of the junior year when the college is a more important thing in their mind. Thank you.

Delegate Mike Mattia: Any other comments or questions? Here none, we will conclude this round table discussion with one straw-poll question. What next step do you want the Recruiting Working Group to take with earlier off-campus contact? Press "1" to develop legislation for the 2015 Convention. Press "2" to take no action. Press "3" for need more information, and press "4" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. Forty-one percent want the Recruiting Working Group to develop legislation for the 2015 Convention. Twenty-seven percent want to take no action. Thirty percent need more information, and there were two percent that abstained. Our next concept, contact on each day of competition will be presented a brief summary, with several straw-poll questions. There will be no round table discussion. This concept will allow institutional coaching staff members to have contact with a prospective student-athlete of contactable age on each day of competition, before or after the competition, provided the prospective student-athlete is considered released or not on call by the appropriate authorities. Allowing contact on each day of competition could enhance the student-athlete experience by allowing prospective student-athletes the opportunity for increased contact with institutional coaches. The contact would also have a positive impact on enrollment management by increasing the number of prospective student-athletes that a given coaching staff member has the opportunity to contact during the same event. Finally, the purposed change also could create efficiencies by allowing institutional coaches to return home after viewing one day of competition as opposed to the need to stay through the conclusion of the entire event prior to contact. The current rule in Division III only allows a coach to make in-person contact with a prospective student-athlete after the prospective student-athlete has completed all competition and has been released by the appropriate authorities. Overall, there was strong support for this concept with seventy five percent of the respondents in favor of it, with and even higher percentage responding that contact on each day of competition should be allowed at scholastic and non-scholastic events. Finally, almost seventy percent of coaches responded that contact on each day of competition would positively impact their ability to fill their roster and meet their institution's enrollment management goals. Since the survey indicated a high level of support, the Recruiting Working Group has two straw-poll questions. Would this concept help make recruiting better for Division III? Press "1" for yes; press "2" for no; press "3" for don't know. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. Seventy-one percent think this would help make the concept better for Division III. Twelve percent, no, and seventeen percent do not know. Thank you. The next straw-poll question is: What do you want the Recruiting Working Group's next steps to be? Press "1" to develop legislation for the 2015 Convention; press "2" to take no action; press "3" for need more information; and press "4" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. Seventy one percent would like the Working Group to develop legislation for the 2015 Convention. Eleven percent take no action, and fifteen percent need more information, and three percent abstain. Thank you very much. I would now like to bring up Keri Luchowski to talk about two more concepts.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Hello, my name is Keri Alexander Luchowski, and I am the executive director of the North Coast Athletic Conference based in Cleveland, Ohio. If anyone is interested in a career change to talk NFL, we have an opening. Please see me afterwards. We are desperate. Our final roundtable discussion this morning will focus on the idea of using an athletic commitment type instrument in Division III. A commitment instrument that would enable student-athletes to athletically commit to an institution and their commitment

would then be honored by other institutions. Our current rules states that an institution shall not use any form of a Letter of Intent or similar form of commitment in the recruitment of a prospective student-athlete. However, an institution can use the pre-enrollment forms that it uses for all students in the recruitment process. An athletic commitment instrument would allow student-athletes the opportunity for an official signing celebrating their high school athletic achievements similar to the National Letter of Intent in Divisions I and II. An athletic commitment would also enable institutions to gain a commitment beyond the traditional admission deposit. This additional commitment would enable head coaches to focus more on uncommitted prospective student-athletes and allow institutions to have an earlier forecast of its incoming class of student-athletes. Under current rules, recruiting by other Division III institutions is permissible until the student arrives on our campuses. Overall, fifty-seven percent of respondents supported the athletic commitment concept in our latest survey. However, there were notable differences in the levels of support between coaches who supported this at sixty percent and conference commissioners and athletic directors who supported it at forty-one percent. There was support from all constituents, an average of eighty-five percent, that this concept would have a positive impact or no impact at all on meeting enrollment management goals. Additionally, just under a quarter of respondents thought an athletic commitment instrument would have a negative impact on prospective student-athletes. Interestingly, when asked about the idea of establishing a penalty if a prospective student-athlete broke his or her commitment, respondents were equally divided between noting a penalty was appropriate; to saying a penalty wasn't appropriate, or just needing more information. In the latest survey, respondents were asked to consider the following points as they relate to an athletic commitment instrument: Should prospective student-athletes be allowed to transfer with a self-release and if the self-release procedures weren't followed, should there be a penalty? Would a small fee to help administer a national data base be a financial burden? Would this concept create an undue burden on compliance officers and coaches who would be asked to monitor commitment letters and update a national database? Should there be implementation of a designated "signing period"? And finally, should an institution's participation in the program be mandatory or could it be voluntary? If the membership wants the Recruiting Working Group to continue examining this concept, we will need specific responses to those questions. Please use the next ten minutes to discuss these questions and the concept of an athletic commitment concept overall. (*Recess.*)

It sounds like you have had some good discussion or feedback on this concept. At this time, are there any questions or comments from the floor? Microphone No. 3.

Delegate Russell Raymond: Hi. I am Russell Raymond with the North Coast Athletic Conference. We were discussing at table 88, would the Letter of Intent that is signed be honored by all Divisions? So, if you sign it and you commit to a Division III school, would Division I and Division II schools have to back away from your recruiting and would it be all Division wide or is it just a Division III level commitment?

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Right now, the concept would just be D-III, but it would be something that we would probably at least discuss with other divisions. But right now we are primarily focused on Division III. The most important part of the Letter of Intent of Division I and Division II, they would probably not recognize this agreement. Microphone No. 5.

Delegate Todd Hutton: Hi I am Todd Hutton, President of Utica College, and a member of the Empire Eight. I rise with a good bit of passion about this, and I have to wonder why we are even talking about it. This in my mind is an anathema to the entire philosophy of Division III. It strips the word "student" out of student-athlete. Nothing is to be gained by students in this. Everything is to be lost, including the flexibility to consider multiple institutions for academic reasons and social and academic environment reasons. There is no scholarship, there is no guarantee of financial aid. It reduces the families and the students' ability to make decisions financially for themselves when they have no guarantee for need-based aid or academic aid. So, I can't understand why we are considering legislation that is so anathema to Division III.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Thank you. Microphone No 2.

Delegate Lisa Melendy: I am Lisa Melendy, Williams College. I was going to say what he said, but not as

well. So, I agree with that. I also would take this opportunity to just thank that Working Group for the work they have done, and I appreciate the wide reaching conversations and the different discussions that we have had. I just want to go back to, however, what I thought was a jumping off point to the original reason for this conversation was work life balance, financial pressures, staffing pressures. It seems that many things we are talking about now is an expansion area, and I would just encourage the group to continue to work and go back to some of those original concepts of finding ways to purpose reducing the pressures to be off-campus, the expense to be off-campus, and the pressures on our coaches, and again in our financial resources. Thank you.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Thank you. Microphone No. 7.

Delegate Robert Anatonucci: I am Robert Anatonucci, Fitchburg State University, president of Fitchburg State University and the Mascot Conference. I will take a little different position than my fellow president. Our feeling is as long as it's a voluntary Letter of Commitment and the student is able to have his or her picture taken on signing day, we think that is a good thing. However, we do not believe in any bureaucracy change in rules, just like the TSA. It should be no fees, no mandatory aspect. One of the SAAC's student-athletes yesterday in our breakfast mentioned the fact that they have signing day in their high school. All the Division I and Division II students are able to go. The Division III students, even though they have made a commitment or been accepted, are standing against the wall. They are fearful of being in the picture because it is a violation of NCAA. So, if we want to do anything, let's make it voluntary, let's make it positive, let's make it void of any NCAA regulations. It is all for the benefit of the student. If it takes away from that student and that student's success, we should not do it. Let's not make a big deal out of it. The federal government instituted the TSA at the airports. What did they turn into? We don't want the NCAA to turn into that, so that we have to build a third office building. Have a good day.

Delegate Cora Brumler: I am Cora Brumler, commissioner of the Little East Conference. I go along with what has already been said, but I would also ask you to consider that given the broad-based programing that is the key to Division III philosophy, we have a lot of student-athletes who are not recruits. They are walk-ons. By moving forward with potential idea, do we create a subclass of student-athletes with our recruits versus our walk-ons who are so critically important to success of our programs, even though they may not have been part of recruiting process? I again just urge you to consider that group of student-athletes while you are considering this proposal.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Thank you. Microphone No. 6.

Delegate Lee Ellis: I am Lee Ellis, Principia College. Keri, I won't say any jokes, but I will say this in terms of thinking about all of these proposals. It seems complicated, it seems sideloaded in some ways because it seems like "if we say yes", we wanted to do this, on one hand, and we do this other thing on the other, it is just adding. I will get back to the point of work life balance. Quite frankly, this is so complicated to me and the discussions that we have been having, I don't know how there is any balance in this at all. So, I would just urge the committee to keep working like Division III coaches recruit 24/7 365 days. Just keep going. We will let you know when you have finally got that right.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Microphone No. 8.

Delegate Dan Fisher: I am Dan Fisher, commissioner of the Landmark Conference. This is just a question. Is it possible to do a straw poll on this issue, even though it is not in the program?

Delegate Keri Luchowski: We will check. Any other questions or comments? Dan Fisher, what would you like us to ask exactly?

Delegate Dan Fisher: My question would be, you know, what is the support of the group? Should we charge the group to -- well I want to see the temperature of the room, really. Do people want to move forward with this? I heard two sides. My table was significantly against this, but I have heard others in support.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: I think when we were putting this together we didn't come up with specific

questions, because there are so many details that could go either way or tried to be figured out that we didn't exactly know what question to ask.

Delegate Dan Fisher: Okay.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Microphone No. 2.

SAAC Member Allie Stevens: My name is Allie Stevens and a field hockey athletic from Catholic University of America. I represent the Landmark Conference and the Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association on the National SAAC. I was urged to come up as a student-athlete to say when I was in high school, I didn't have a chance to sign the Letter of Intent, and I think that is a really meaningful thing for a student-athlete. But I also don't think there needs to be the punitive factor, because that takes away from the D-III philosophy. Thank you.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Thank you. Microphone No. 9.

Delegate Donna Ledwin: I am Donna Ledwin, Commissioner of the Allegany Mountain Collegiate Conference. Keri, could I suggest we have a series of very similar poll questions for the straw polls in response to this? Can't we just use that same template on first one, that we would like the committee to explore legislation and the fact, "1". No, we don't want it. "2", "3" is more information, and whatever the "4" was. We will just use that same template.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: We are going to ask and see if we can get that. Microphone No. 7.

Delegate Maria Eftink: I am Maria Eftink, Fontbonne University. I am director of athletics at Fontbonne University, and I don't know what we are going to get out of this specific question. At least at our table and hearing from the SAAC, I feel like the question would be better, can we have a signing with the student-athletes having the ability of having their coach there and photos? I think that is what we hear from our prospectives more so. As we mentioned, this is a complicated issue. I think we can see, one, we don't want to punish our student-athletes because a lot of them can't afford those punishments. They should have the ability to change their mind because their circumstances do change within their decision, but also I can see having some violations if the coaches didn't know about commitments and then putting stuff out there front rush. I think the crux of the question is more the signing, whatever you want. I know the word "signing" is the word we can't say, but to have the coaches there that have developed that relationship with them and celebrate it because we are about the student-athletes. The student-athletes are saying that they are wanting this. I think that should be the legislation that we at least say if we are interested in it or not.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Thank you. We are going to take a brief minute and see what we can get up onto the voting for you on the participating. That was very brief. The straw-poll question: What do you want the Recruiting Working Groups next steps to be? "1" develop legislation for the 2015 Convention. "2" take no action. "3" need more information. "4", abstain. The polls are now open. This is about the signing of a commitment. The polls are now closed. Just a reminder, this is not binding. This is purely for feedback. So, twenty-eight percent said develop legislation for next convention. Forty-three percent said no action. Twenty nine percent need more information. There is absolutely no abstaining. That is a good job. Microphone No. 4.

Delegate Nancy Meyer: I am Nancy Meyer, Calvin College, Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association. I am going to back up my student SAAC rep, Allie. Could we now have a poll as to whether we would be in favor of just a celebratory event, no legal commitment?

Delegate Keri Luchowski: One more brief moment. Microphone No. 5.

SAAC Member Bob Koba: Good afternoon. My name is Bob Koba. I am a student-athlete at North Central College and I serve on the Division III Student Athlete Advisory Committee. Just speaking to the statement earlier about we are student-athletes first, and we 100 percent agree with that. There was just one point at my table

that you hang your diploma, your letter of substance from the institution, so why not have a Letter of Intent that you are proud of your athletic ability to hang next to those from a student-athlete perspective?

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Thank you. For our last straw poll on this topic, should there be an allowance for a non-binding celebratory signing, meaning coaches can be present at this type of event. This is not legislation, this is not binding, this is feedback that we are asking for to be fair. Press “1” for yes. Press “2” for no, and press “3” to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. Sixty-nine percent think “yes”, there should be such an allowance. Twenty-seven percent no, and four percent abstain. The last question. Microphone No. 2.

Delegate Tom Hart: I am Tom Hart from Berry College and representing the fine folks at table 63. In anticipating that was going to be the results that showed from the straw poll, one of the thoughts in an effort to promote Division III, in an effort to get the word out about an athlete, our student-athletes feel proud about the fact that they are going to Division III, would it be possible to have this commitment today during the Division III week when we have the student-athlete Division III experience? Wouldn't that be a good opportunity for us to celebrate the ideal that they are signing and that they are going to be committing to Division III schools? That was just a thought.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: We will take the fact up with the Recruiting Working Group. Thank you. The last question, Microphone No. 8. **Delegate Chuck Gordon:** I am Chuck Gordon, Ramapo College in New Jersey. While I have no opinion on the Super Bowl, I will encourage the attendees, not like San Diego, bring a coat, a hat and gloves if you are going to Super Bowl. Did I hear that we just voted “yes” to include searches attending this? Is that what the chair offered, we would have a signing day that was permissive for coaches to attend? I hope I didn't hear that.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: This is just for feedback.

Delegate Chuck Gordon: I just assumed that coaches would not be a part of that. I guess I am unclear as to the comment that came from the chair.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: We have not actually determined anything specific at this point.

Delegate Chuck Gordon: I thought we were trying to address work life balance, cost and other things, the rearranging of hats, where we have four people standing there, and three put on the hat from the other institution, et cetera.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Thank you. Microphone No. 9.

Delegate Donna Harmon: I am Donna Harmon, Worcester Polytechnic Institute. Since we are giving feedback on how we would do potentially the signing, I highly recommend that we tie it to when the student makes their deposit to our institution.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: Our final summary and straw-poll voting is on the concept of expanding the current Division III legislation relating to social media. There will be no round table discussions on this concept. This concept proposes allowing coaches to “friend” or “follow” prospective student-athletes on social media. Currently, a coaching staff member may communicate with a prospective student-athlete via social media provided the communication is private and direct between the coach and the prospective student-athlete. While “friending” or “following” is permitted in Divisions I and II, as a confirmation of recruitment, it is not allowed for us in Division III. In the latest survey, respondents were evenly divided between supporting and opposing this concept as well as its impact on prospective student-athletes. However, eighty-six percent noted that it would have a positive or no impact at all on meeting an institution's enrollment goals. The Recruiting Working Group believes there isn't a lot more that we can discuss with this particular concept in that we either keep our current rules and keep the communication private, or look to expand them to mirror Divisions I and II. Therefore, our last two straw-poll questions are the following; Would this concept help make recruiting better for Division III? Press “1” for yes;

press “2” for no; and “3” for don’t know. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. Twenty-seven percent said yes, this would make recruiting in Division III better. Fifty eight percent said no, and fifteen percent don’t know. The next question is what do you want the Recruiting Working Group’s next steps to be? Press “1” to develop legislation for the 2015 convention. Press “2” to take no action. Press “3” for need more information; and press “4” to abstain. The polls are now closed. Twenty-six percent said to develop legislation for the 2015 convention. Sixty-two percent take no action, ten percent need more information, and two percent abstain. Now, I would like to introduce Dr. Barney Forsythe, president at Westminster College.

Delegate Barney Forsythe: Hello, I am Barney Forsythe, president at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri. On behalf of Working Group on recruitment, I want to thank you for your participation this morning. Today is another step in ensuring that the Recruiting Working Group’s efforts remain responsive to you, the membership. Your feedback and input today will direct our future work. We have enjoyed hearing your comments and hearing the passion in your comments and your suggestions and your ideas, and we will look forward to reviewing the feedback that was reported at the roundtable discussions. As a Working Group, we entered today’s session with one primary goal. We wanted a clear dsense of irection from you for how we should move forward with the proposed concepts, and we have accomplished this goal. Thank you.

Two hours is a short amount of time to discuss these important, topics so please note that more in-depth information is located on the Division III homepage. I encourage you to review it. Over the course of the last 18 months, we have heard directly from you via three surveys; in-person meetings, and direct communication. However, we want and need to hear more. We need to hear from our institutions, our coaches, our student-athletes and organizations and governing bodies, those who understand and influence our sport programs in very meaningful ways. We need to ensure that all voices are heard. Today’s roundtable notes, feedback via the microphone and straw-poll questions will guides this group’s work leading up to the 2015 Convention and beyond. And, like all the information we obtained or developed, the notes from the roundtable will also be posted on the Division III’s homepage. And last year’s Convention, we asked that if we as a division could make recruiting better for our coaches, student-athletes, administrators and institutions? As a group, we understood the significance of this question, and we believe that over the past year with your input, we are closer to answering this question and finding ways to make recruiting better, and yet we still have work to do. We have heard you and we know that. We have proposed concepts that are challenging. We have discussed these concepts, as you did, with an eye toward our Division III philosophy, strategic platform and the sport culture in which we find ourselves. We will only move forward with concepts for which you have given us clear direction. Once again we greatly appreciated your participation today, and we look forward to continued conversation in the months to come. At this time, are there any comments from the floor? Are there any comments from the floor? Seeing there are no final comments at this point, thank you, and I will turn the agenda back to President Ohle. (Applause)

Chairman Ohle: Thank you, Barney. I hope that you have a sense of the importance of the opportunity to hear the voices. I said in my remarks last night at the Business Session that it is important for us to listen, and I believe that. I think over the last number of years we, as an Association and we, as a division have become very aware of the sense of the body. I also said last night how appreciative we are of our SAAC members. I want to thank them for coming forward to speak to some of these issues, and they will be engaged in that. We will have an opportunity tomorrow to thank them for all they have done, but it is encouraging to see so many people involved in this discussion that is so important for us. There are no easy answers. We have said that before. But we are a division that really works together, and I want to again thank David Barney, Karen, Mike and Keri. This Working Group is doing a fantastic job. Thank you for all of you work. (Applause)

We will now begin our last section on the town hall sessions, and let me introduce my colleague and friend, Sharon Hertzberger, who, as I mentioned earlier, is the chair-elect and will be in this position next year. She will do a magnificent job, and she will moderate this town hall session.

Moderator Hertzberger: Thank you, Jack. I want to say it is not about Patriots, the Ravens or all these oth-

ers, it is all about the Poet. Go Poet. I want to introduce the NCAA staff and Committee members you have joined us on the dais to assist with the town hall session. The first is Liz Suscha, who serves as director of championships and is the chief liaison to the Division III Championships Committee. Second is Sue Lauder, director of athletics at Fitchburg State University, and chair of the Championships Committee. Third, we are joined by Eric Hartung, associate director of Division III research at the National office. Fourth, President Al Cureton, from the University of Northwestern, St. Paul, and vice-chair of the Presidents Council. Fifth is Dan Calandro, associate director of Division III and the Conference Grant Program Administrator. And last is Terri Deike, director of athletics at LeTourneau University, and chair of the Membership Committee. Our goal during this session is to hear directly from you on several important topics, and to help guide the governance structure as we plan into the future. We will discuss two topics during this town hall session, and if time permits we will cover a third topic. The first topic includes championship's selections, recent changes in selection criteria and in our region policies. Second, we will discuss campus budget restraints and its impact on athletic programs in the future. Our third topic, if time permits, will be the conference-based rules seminars. Please note that today's town hall topics were chosen by the Convention Planning Sub-committee, based on responses from a September membership survey. Our sincere thanks to the over 200 who responded. We will have the following format during this town hall session. We will provide a brief historical context and research findings for each topic. Then, we will open the floor for questions and comments from the membership. After about 12 to 15 minutes of a Q&A period, we will ask one or two straw-poll questions on each topic. We will use your feedback and the straw-poll results to guide our related governance structure discussion. Are there any questions? At this time I would like to invite Liz Suscha to the microphone and get us started on the first session.

Mrs. Liz Suscha: Thank you President Hertzberger. As mentioned, I am Liz Suscha. I represent our championships staff. I am glad to be here with you today to talk about a few updates or information related to our championships program. So, with that, in the past year, there have been changes in the championships selection criteria process and in-region policies. Some of the policies went into effect this year and several will take effect with the 2014-15 academic year. These changes have generated some membership discussion, and our hope today is to be able and we would like to offer some clarifying information as well as answer your questions. With the start of this year, the selection criteria were changed to include all contests against Division III opponents in the primary criteria, and all contests against opponents from other classifications, those in Division I, Division II, NAIA, provisional members in years one and two in the process to be considered in the secondary criteria. In just a few minutes, we will review a companion change to the in-region competition requirement which maintains an emphasis on in-region play. Two other changes came into play this year. First the criterion used for results versus ranked opponents is now based on results versus ranked Division III teams as established by rankings at the time of selection. And, secondly, regions now will be only ranking fifteen percent of their teams per region, with a minimum of six teams per region. There would be an exception for rolling. Regarding the change to the in-region competition requirements, in all team sports, the threshold of in-region scheduled games increased from fifty to seventy percent, and to fifty percent for tennis and twenty-five percent for golf. While every Division III contest is now considered in the primary criteria. The requirements for in-region competition were increased to continue the emphasis on in-region play, which is a cornerstone of the Division III philosophy. The new higher threshold is not applicable for cross country, indoor and outdoor track and field, swimming and diving and wrestling. Also, keep in mind that the new criteria is for championships eligibility only, and not requirements for sport sponsorship minimums, and it is based on scheduled games and not games played. To give an idea how many programs and institutions are challenged by the new requirements, this fall, just over twenty programs across all of our fall sports were out of compliance and many received a waiver through our waiver process. There are even fewer member schools out of compliance for the winter championships season, many of which many will also receive a waiver as considered by the Division III Championship Committee. There are also four new changes that will take effect next year. The mileage radius to define in-region competition will increase to 500 miles from 200 miles and your one and two provisional/reclassifying institutions can count as an in-region opponent in the calculation, assuming at least one of the in-region definitions is met with these provisional institutions. Millage calculations should be using the NCAA's TES system. Note for sport committee rankings and selections, competition against year one

and two year provisional and reclassifying institutions still remains in the secondary criteria. Conference postseason competition will not include in-region calculation and for spring championship against out- of-region opponents over an official vacation period, such as spring break, maybe exempted from the calculation. If an institution doesn't meet the new criteria for a given year, it may file for a waiver through the Championships Committee. The waiver deadline is no later than December 31st of the year before the championships. Along with Sue Lauder, chair of the Championship Committee, we will now hear your comments and answer your questions related to the new selection criteria and in-region policies.

Moderator Hertzberger: Are there any questions? If you would, please, go to a microphone. Should we go to the straw-poll question? Please remember that these straw-poll votes are anonymous and do not represent a binding resolution vote. With a Division III philosophy that emphasizes in-region competition as a guidepost, the Championships Committee had several years of conversation regarding regional alignment and selection criteria. If the committee is going to take next steps what is the next area to explore? Press "1" for exploring contiguous states; press "2" for establishing minimum contest for conference regular season play; press "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. The result is forty-two percent to explore contiguous states. Twenty-five percent establish minimum contest for conference regular season play, and thirty-three percent abstaining. Thank you for that feedback. That concludes are discussion of the championships selection criteria process and in-region policies. The second topic of this town hall session relates to campus budget restraints and their impact on athletic programs. Last February's membership-wide survey, which had a response rate of seventy-seven percent of our members, among many issues, asked about current and future budget issues could affect an institution's athletic program. Approximately, forty two percent of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that in the next three to five years, changes to funding athletic budgets would be likely to affect the operation of athletic programs and the ability to keep the funding at the current level. Another group of people thought that the changes would be coming in the next six to ten years. So, nearly half of Division III membership strongly agreed, or agreed that budget issues could affect athletics. Less than seventeen percent contended that budget issues would not have an impact. The profile of the seventeen percent of those who did not expect an impact was the following: They tend to be private institutions, having a larger athletics budget, having a smaller proportion of their institutional budget allocated to athletics. They direct more of their athletics budget to compensation than to other spending issues, and they have avoided in the past five years an enrollment drop in first year students in particular on their campus. Before we take questions and comments from the microphones, we will have a straw-poll question for you. Which budget area causes you the most concern going forward? Press "1" for an overall funding of sports programs, considering dropping sports? Press "2" for compensation,adequate pay for coaches and staff? Press "3" for regular season travel and other participation expenses. Press "4" for facility expenses and renovations. And press "5" for recruiting expenses. You will note that we did not give you "6" which is all. We would like your feedback on the one area you are most concerned about on your campuses. The polls are open. The polls are closed. It is pretty well split. Twenty-one percent of the overall funding in sports programs and the possibility of dropping sports. Twenty-eight percent compensation, adequate pay for coaches and staff. Thirty percent regular season travel and other participation expenses. Nineteen percent for facility expenses, and only two percent on recruiting expenses. Thank you for that. Eric Hartung, who is our associate director of research, along with President Al Cureton, will be happy to address your questions and comments in relation to the membership survey. If you have any questions or comments, please go to the microphones. We are getting hungry, tired, I see. Thank you.

Now for another straw-poll question. How can the NCAA address this issue in helping you now? Press "1" to provide more information on financial tools. Press "2" to provide educational program and develop best practices. Press "3", NCAA collaboration with your conferences in this area. Press "4" to increase grant funding. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. Sixty-four percent want us to increase grant funding. Seventeen percent collaborate with conferences. Seventeen percent provide educational programming, and twelve percent more financial tools. Thank you for that.

Let's move on to discuss the conference rules seminars. During the summer of 2012, nine New England conferences piloted a conference rules seminar. This seminar modeled the traditional Regional Rules Seminar, but it

was held in a location central to the conference member institutions. Over 400 athletics administrators, coaches, compliance officers and faculty athletics representatives attended the one-day seminar and satisfied the once in three-year seminar attendance requirement for attendance at a Regional Rules Seminar. Since the seminar was held in a central location, travel cost were greatly reduced. Feedback from the participating conferences was very positive. Over the past year, the Membership Committee has been working hard to develop a process that would enable a replication of these initial pilot seminars to be done on a regular basis. After a year of research, data collection and discussions, the Membership Committee released 2015 conference rules seminar application last November. The application process will remain open until April 1st 2014. During its June meeting, the Membership Committee will review the submitted applications, and make a recommendation to the Management Council regarding the further establishment of this program. The goal is to announce the 2015 conference rules seminar location by August, 1st 2014. The Membership Committee also established minimum requirements to host a conference rules seminar. A few key requirements are that a minimum of four conferences must collaborate in hosting a seminar, and a seminar must have a minimum of 325 attendees. Conference rules seminars may not be held in a location that is within 300 miles of the traditional association-wide Regional Rules Seminar. The 2015 Regional Rules Seminar will be held in Indianapolis and Denver. For all of the established requirements, please review the application which is located on the program HUB. Since conferences will be responsible for all costs associated with the rules seminars, the Membership Committee will determine that conferences may use a maximum of ten percent of their tier three funds from the Conference Grant Program to help off-set the operational costs. Similar to the Regional Rules seminar, NCAA staff will develop and present seminar content.

At this time, to answer your questions, we have Dan Calandro, associate director of Governance and the Conference Grant Program Administrator and Terri Deike, Director of Athletics at Letourneau University and Chair of the Membership Committee will answer your questions or hear your comments.

Chairman Ohle: It is an exciting subject.

Moderator Hertzberger: With that, I want to thank the participants up here for their hard work in preparing this. It was obviously very clear to them. Thank you. Jack. *(Applause)*

Chairman Ohle: Thank you Sharon. My thanks today to the presenters. I think it is something that is very important for all of us to understand the work that goes behind this. These individuals are giving of their time in a volunteer way to really examine the questions that are important to all of us that we heard you. So, I want to thank them and I want to ask you to again give a round of applause for everybody who participated, please. *(Applause)*

I do believe that we will all benefit from the input that we have received and the topic that we have discussed. I also hope that the session provided information that will aid your legislative discussions later today when you get together with your conferences and for your voting tomorrow. As I said earlier, I think we have come a long way. These sessions set up tomorrow very nicely. They give us a chance to set up for the next few years considerations for legislation and have a general feeling among all of us of the importance of how we work together and listen to all of the constituents. Please remember to leave your voting unit at your seat. Tomorrow, delegates will be able to pick up a newly charged voting unit. Delegates, you must bring your smart card and voting paddle for tomorrow's business session. Table facilitators please bring any hard copy feedback forms to the staff at the desk.

Let me remind our presidents and chancellors that a luncheon and issues forum will begin shortly in the Sapphire Ballroom A. A luncheon for athletics direct reports will also take place in the Sapphire Room 410.

May all of you have a productive afternoon conference meetings. Thank you for being here. It has been a great day. We are adjourned.

(The meeting was dually adjourned at 11:15 A.M.)

PROCEEDINGS
of the
49TH NCAA HONORS CELEBRATION
NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

JANUARY 17, 2014
HILTON BAYFRONT HOTEL
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

49TH NCAA HONORS CELEBRATION

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 2014

(The 49th NCAA Honors Celebration was held at the Hilton Bayfront Hotel, San Diego, California, on January 17, 2014, with Master of Ceremonies Jack Ford presiding.)

The Announcer: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome our Master of Ceremonies for the evening, Emmy and Peabody Award-winning television journalist, former Yale football student-athlete and Silver Anniversary Award winner, Jack Ford. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening to all of you. Welcome to the 49th annual NCAA Honors Celebration. We will start off by thanking for the opening number the University of California, San Diego Pep Band. Our thanks to them. *(Applause)*

Those of you who can remember some of the music in the 40's in the mood, perhaps, would thank them also for us getting in the mood for the celebration this evening.

Is it my pleasure to be your host yet again tonight, and a greater pleasure for you all to meet our 2014 honorees. So, let's begin the night by bringing them in now.

First, the 2014 NCAA Today's Top Ten Award recipients:

From the University of Arizona, Brigetta Barrett.

Representing the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Amber Brooks.

Representing the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Raven Chavanne.

From the University of Delaware, Elena Delle Donne.

From Concordia University, St. Paul, Ellie Duffy.

From the University of Alabama, Barrett Jones.

Next from the University of North Dakota, Jocelyne Lamoureux.

From the University of Wisconsin, Stout, Tim Nelson.

From Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Kayla Shull.

Representing the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Mary Weatherholt.

And now the 2014 Inspiration Award Recipient, from the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse, Jason Church.

The 2014 NCAA Award of Valor, representing the University of New Hampshire, Cameron Lyle.

And now the 2014 NCAA Silver Anniversary Honorees.

Unable to be with us tonight from the University of California, Los Angeles, Troy Aikman.

From the University of Southern California, Rodney Peete.

Representing Yale University, Earl Martin Phalen.

From Brown University, George Pyne.

From the University of New Hampshire, Katey Stone.

And representing the University of Florida, Dara Torres.

And now please join me in welcoming the distinguished recipient of the 2014 NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award, from the University of Kansas, Billy Mills. (*Applause*)

Ladies and gentlemen, our 2014 NCAA Honors Recipients. (*Applause*) You will learn more about each of these individuals throughout the evening.

It is certainly indeed a remarkable group of honorees here with us tonight. I have had the distinct pleasure of hosting this event for a number of years. Each year I stand in awe of the achievements of the men and women who take the stage to receive these awards.

Many of you have been here before, and you understand what a special event this is. Some of you are here for the first time, and you will recognize it very quickly. Not only do we celebrate these individuals and their accomplishments, but perhaps more importantly we celebrate the values and the value of intercollegiate athletics.

Now, the significance then, of the contributions of these individuals, the generosity of their spirit and unparalleled leadership mark them all as inspiring role models and quite simply all are outstanding human beings.

Now, during tonight's program, we are going to introduce you to our award recipients and they will share a little of their stories with you.

We will recognize the first group of honorees before we break for dinner, and then we will conclude with the second group after you have had a chance to eat and chat with some of the folks around you. I also remind you following the celebration, dessert will be served in the foyer, and each of you individually may meet the honorees and chat with them.

Before we get started, I would like to take a moment and recognize a special guest here with us this evening. Please welcome the chair of the NCAA Executive Committee and the president of Michigan State University, Dr. Lou Anna Simon. (*Applause*)

You will hear from President Simon a little later this evening.

Now, I would like you to join me in welcoming a good friend of mine and all of us, the NCAA President, Mark Emmert. (*Applause*)

President Emmert: Thank you Jack. First of all, would you all join me in thanking Jack Ford, who has done this many, many times? He makes a special effort to be here to do this show. It is wonderful to have you back, Jack, a Silver Award winner yourself. Thank you very much for what you do for the NCAA. (*Applause*)

For all of us that have been to Conventions before, this is obviously the highlight of the week and all the meetings, and for those of you who are delegates in the audience you have been spending days and days now talking about minutia details, rules, regulations and some have the occasion feeling they are pretty trivial and a lot of frustrations in them. This night is the award. This is the night where you get to look at the young men and women, sometimes not so young men and women who have gone out in their lives and accomplished extraordinary things because they were at least in part because they were student-athletes and the environment they got to

enjoy because of what you do on our campuses.

There are a lot of people that will say, some in this audience, in fact, that have participating in that will say the toughest jobs in the NCAA right now are being part of the Committees. The Sports Committees that oversee the tournament and select the teams that have to play in the tournament, and set them in the seedings so they can compete together. I think that is really, really important and really a difficult task, but it is not as hard as the job of picking the honorees out of all the wonderful people that have been successful student-athletes. So, I want to, before we proceed with the program, to please ask the members of the Honors Selection Committee to stand and let all of us thank you for the hard work that it takes to pick all these people and make these selections, because you have a really tough task. All of the Honors Selection Committee members in the room, please stand up. I know you're out there. *(Applause)*

So, on behalf of the entire NCAA and the honorees tonight, congratulations and you make us incredibly proud, and we are delighted that you are here, and we really look forward to this program tonight. Thank you again. And, Jack, it is all yours. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Thank you, Mark, again. Tonight's Award Ceremony begins with the first of our 2014 Today's Top Ten Award recipients. Today's Top Ten Award Honorees are outstanding student-athletes and outstanding senior student-athletes from the preceding academic year who have accomplished stellar careers academically in intercollegiate athletics and demonstrated unparalleled character and leadership traits in their schools and their communities.

Our first honoree from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Amber Brooks.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time)

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Please welcome from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, faculty athletics representative, Lissa Broome, and Amber Brooks. *(Applause)*

Amber, congratulations to you. We know what an outstanding collegiate career you have had. You have recently been playing professional over in Germany, and you have come back now and what are your plans?

Ms. Amber Brooks: I really definitely enjoyed my experience playing in Germany this past year, but I am defiantly excited to return stateside. I recently signed a contract to play with the Portland in the Nationals in the soccer league and I am also training with another National team in hopes of making the roster and playing in the World Cup.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: We are glad to have you back, and we would bet on you, if betting was allowed. Congratulations and thank you so much. *(Applause)*

Our next Honoree represents the first of our Silver Anniversary Winners. The NCAA Silver Anniversary Awards are given to former student-athletes on the 25th anniversary of the completion of their eligibility.

Now, 25 years these honorees are pretty much like our Today's Top Ten Honorees, and they channel all that passion and confidence in truly outstanding achievements.

Our first Silver Anniversary Honoree is George Pyne, a two-year starter at offensive tackle and senior team captain for the Brown University football team. He served 11 years as the chief operating officer of NASCAR before being made president of IMG Sports and Entertainment. Also, he serves as a board member of the National Football Foundation, which seeks to promote leadership, sportsmanship, competitive zeal and drive for academic excellence in America's young people.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please join me in welcoming from Brown University, the director of athletics, Jack Hayes and George Pyne. *(Applause)*

George, congratulations. You and I have been friends for a while now, and I know how important your affiliation with Brown means to you. What was it about that experience that was so instrumental in forming the contours of your life?

Mr. George Pyne: A couple of things. One, great people. I know we have a bunch of people from Brown, two Super Bowl champions tonight, and the people were special, some of my best friends in my whole life. Also, coming from a humble upbringing, my dad sold insurance, my mother was a school teacher for 22 years, and I was from a homogenous world, and to go and to meet at Brown people from all over the world made me a better person. That is what I take away from my experience at Brown. Also, learning how to win and also how to lose, and being a part of all things was special.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: I know how proud you are of Brown, and I know how proud Brown University is in having you as an alumnus. Congratulations, George. *(Applause)*

The next Honoree is the Top Ten winner representing the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Mary Weatherholt.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please welcome the chancellor of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Harvey Perlman, and Mary Weatherholt. *(Applause)*

Mary, congratulations to you. You talk about your transition. It is not always easy for outstanding athletes to transition to become coaches, and not necessarily to do it seamlessly. You seem to have it. What do you enjoy most about coaching and what have you learned from it?

Mr. Mary Weatherholt: It is a different transition, but it is really a fun one. It is exhausting and at school you see the other side. I love working with another team, the girls, and a lot of the same things that you help them to succeed. But not only in what I play, I am trying to do something well. But as a coach I am trying to communicate well with them, help them to start believing in themselves and believe in themselves. It has been a transition that I enjoy.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: I know they are very happy to have you as their coach. Congratulations to you, Mary, and your team. *(Applause)*

Our next Today's Top Ten Honoree, from the University of Wisconsin, Stout, Tim Nelson.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

From the University of Wisconsin, Stout, the director of athletics, Duey Nastz, and Tim Nelson. *(Applause)*

So, you talked in the video about the transformation that a young athlete often has to make, from focusing on yourself to focusing on the team. How, then, has that transformation helped you as you have gone from a student-athlete to a member of the Military?

Mr. Tim Nelson: Well, it doesn't come as much of a surprise, Jack, but I truly learned the importance of a team or a unit. I really believe my greatest accomplishment comes from working with others. I don't think you can reach your full potential just on your own by yourself. So, being part of the team, I was able to work out with a lot of great people and run with a lot of guys, and we were all working toward one common goal, train-

ing hard together with your best friends towards something you all valued. Being in the Army is very similar, but it takes a lot more serious approach because if you are working together with your brothers and sisters. That is not for a trophy, but to fight a nation to win wars. It is a little more serious, but at the end of the day all things come down to the same thing, love, you know, teamwork, confidence, trust, respect, faith in one another. So, those were some of the great lessons. I think it really comes down to really believing in the unit that you are part of the team, and part of having pride. I am proud of my platoon, and I am proud to be a member of the WIAC, and Division III athletics. I am proud to be a soldier defending the greatest nation in the world. I think that is what I have learned the most about being a teammate and the teamwork. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: All of us are really proud in having you being one of the young people who are defending us and our country, Tim. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Our next Silver Anniversary Award Winner is Katey Stone, a four-year letter winner both in lacrosse and ice hockey at the University of New Hampshire. Today, she is on leave from her position as coach of Harvard University women's ice hockey team to serve as the head coach of the U.S. Olympics Ice Hockey Team. She will coach the 2014 Olympics, making her the first woman to lead the U.S. National team into the Olympic Competition. Let's hear a little about Katey Stone.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please welcome from the University of New Hampshire, the director of athletics Mary Scarano with Katey Stone. Katey, congratulations. You have a busy couple of weeks here, don't you?

Ms. Katey Stone: A little bit.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: If you look at those pictures of you as a young athlete, did you ever think that somehow, some way that you might not be only going to the Olympics, but going as the first woman to lead the women's ice hockey team?

Ms. Katey Stone: Absolutely not. It never dawned on me.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: What is that message? Can you talk about a little bit about the video, what is the message when you have great success as a player, great success at Harvard and thinking on this magnificent journey to the Olympics? What is the message?

Ms. Katey Stone: I think the message is to take advantage of every opportunity you get, try to do the best you can every day, do things the right way, and eventually somebody is going to pay attention to that.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: I am going to echo what you have said on the video, and that is awesome, and you are awesome. Congratulations.

Ms. Katey Stone: Thank you. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Good luck.

Ms. Katey Stone: Thank you.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Our next Top Ten Honoree from the University of Arizona, Brigetta Barrett.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Welcome from the University of Arizona, vice president for athletics, Greg Byrne, and Ms. Brigetta Barrett. Brigetta, congratulations to you. It is clear not only from the video but from what having spent 30 seconds

with you, you have a passion for your theater, for your performing passion, for your jumping and the Olympic training. Do the two work together in some fashion?

Ms. Brigetta Barrett: Yes, they do. If you had asked me last week how can I do it, I think in the same way that Ronald Reagan succeeded in being the president of the United States and also a radio and television actor. If God hands you a choice, do I just play with my doll? No, I impeccable jump, why can't I do acting and singing and poetry? I want to see the world, not how, but why not?

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Like you said on the video, I suspect you can do whatever you want to do. I think we will see that. In respect to what you want to do, I think there is a message that you want to send out to someone special here.

Ms. Brigetta Barrett: Happy Birthday, Mom. It has been an honor to be your daughter for the past 22 years, and I really don't think that God could have made me in more capable, strong, beautiful hands. I love you. **(Applause)**

Master of Ceremonies Ford: I bet she says the same thing. *(Applause)*

Our next Silver Anniversary Winner is Earl Martin Phalen, who says being a member of the Yale basketball team played a significant role in his success as a student and later as a professional.

Today, he is the founder of the George and Veronica Phalen Leadership Academies, chartered schools in Indiana and are projected to serve more than 10,000 students each year. Let's meet Earl.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please welcome from Yale University, senior associate director of athletics, Barbara Chesler, with Earl Martin Phalen. *(Applause)*

Congratulations, Martin, let me ask you something. I saw you on the video and you are talking about these young people. You don't call them kids, you don't call them students, you call them scholars. Why is that important?

Mr. Earl Martin Phalen: We believe so much in the potential of every single child, which I shared with the five, six or seven year olds. Your life is ever going to be changed because you get the same educational opportunity, and you walk two blocks down the street and you see children lives will never be able to realize their tremendous potential because they don't have that high quality of education necessary, that we want our children to have. They have great potential in 10 schools and 10,000 kids, and our next step is to raise \$42 million, so, anybody that wants to join the cause, and then make sure we help our smaller, weaker students, and make sure they will just like the recent graduates they have seen tonight.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: There is also another expression that goes, "When a student is ready, the teacher will appear." I think these 10,000 students are very fortunate. Congratulations.

Mr. Earl Martin Phalen: Thank you.

NCAA INSPIRATION AWARD WINNER

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Our next honoree is receiving the NCAA Inspiration Award reserved for incredible people that are confronted with a life-changing event, used their determination and perseverance to overcome that obstacle and as a result serve as a role model to others. Our winner tonight is Jason Church. He certainly fits that criteria as a leader, role model and indeed as an inspiration. Let's hear from him.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

From the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse, the director of athletics, Josh Whitman, with Jason

Church. *(Applause)*

(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)

Jason, congratulations to you. Again, when you listen to what you are saying on the video, and I am struck by one thing, you talked about this life-changing event. But then you talked about it in terms of positives that can come from such, what other people think would be a shattering event. What do you mean by that?

Mr. Jason Church: You know, I often tell people when I go around speaking and meeting other people is although I have lost my legs, God has given me a platform to stand on. It is an opportunity. There are so many things I can tell you about life. I can tell you one thing I have learned is the true power of a positive attitude can really, really change your outlook on life.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: You know, we tend sometimes to toss around the term “hero” very casually, but I think what we have come to realize with people like you is that heroes are ordinary persons that are confronted with a great crisis that has the capacity to do extraordinary things. I think by any definition that we can agree that you are one of our Heroes. We are honored to honor you tonight. *(Applause)*

You will recall when I opened this up I talked about both values and the value. I don’t imagine that there could be any better demonstration than Jason. Again, we are honored to have you here with us this evening.

That concludes our first half of tonight’s presentation. We will take a quick break for dinner and bring back the rest of our recipients.

A reminder, after the program concludes, the dessert is going to be presented out in the foyer. Enjoy your dinner and we will be back in a little while.

(Whereupon, dinner is served at this time.)

The Announcer: Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome back Jack Ford. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: I hope you have had the opportunity to enjoy your dinner. Give a round of applause to the people that served the meal. They did a wonderful job. *(Applause)*

We begin our next half of our program with the NCAA Award of Valor.

PRESENTATION OF THE AWARD OF VALOR

The Award of Valor is reserved for courageous individuals who perform above and beyond the call of duty in a dangerous situation. Our winner tonight is Cameron Lyle. Lyle never thought a quick cheek swab would give him an opportunity to change another man’s life. Let’s take a look at the story.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please join me in welcoming from the University of New Hampshire the head coach of track and field and cross country, Jim Boulanger, along with Cameron Lyle.

(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)

Congratulations, Cameron. Since you have already done something more than anybody would ever be expected to do, and even after that you have become this fierce advocate for being the match. Why, after the fact has it become so important to you?

Mr. Cameron Lyle: I have been a part of the program, and I have seen firsthand the impact that you have on another’s life if you are able to donate. Plus all the info they provide to you in that the odds are ridiculous against people with leukemia and blood cancer. I wanted to get out there and do what I could to get the

numbers up. That is why I have done a few events and I plan to organize a lot more this summer.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Your coach said that kind of dedication for others is indeed priceless. Congratulations. We are proud to honor you tonight. Thank you.

Mr. Cameron Lyle: Thank you. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Our next Top Ten Winner, representing the University of Delaware, Elena Delle Donne.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please welcome deputy director of athletics, Samantha Huge, with Elena Delle Donne. *(Applause)*

Congratulations to you, Elena Delle Donne. As part of your journey as a student-athlete, you actually found yourself having to rediscover your passion for your game. You clearly had an extraordinary successful career once you did. How did that help you to accomplish that? What kind of message can you give them about that notion of the passion for your game?

Ms. Elena Delle Donne: You know, I was at a point in time where I woke up and had lost the passion for basketball, something I had been doing my entire life. The biggest thing for me was to just figure out where I was outside of basketball, what else was I interested in? When I was able to do that and figure that out, I had the passion for basketball again, but I had even more passion for life.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Certainly, the University of Delaware and your fans, the young people all around in the game are glad that you rediscovered that passion and that is just a marvelous and successful career. Congratulations.

Ms. Elena Delle Donne: Thank you. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Our next honoree from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Raven Chavanne.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please welcome from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, senior associate director of athletics, Mike Ward with Raven Chavanne. Congratulations to you, also. So, you had great success on the collegiate level, success on the international level Team USA. I think the question we always ask athletes at that level is what did you learn as a student-athlete that you were able to transfer to more difficult experiences of being an international athlete?

Ms. Raven Chavanne: I would say the most important thing I took away was just teamwork in general. On the first day, you know, of school we get together and we form team goals, and just learning how to be a team with new people every single year. In college you have the whole year to become a team, but in Team USA literally you are picked for the team, practice for three days, and we are playing teams that have been together for five years. So, I would just be learning how to communicate and lead, in the four years at the international level, was the most important thing.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: I think they are glad to have you on Team USA, and congratulations to you on your success. *(Applause)*

Our next Silver Anniversary winner could not be with us tonight due to his broadcast obligations for the NFL Playoffs. Former University of California, Los Angeles, a quarterback, Troy Aikman, is the winningest NFL quarterback of any decade and ended his NFL career at the Dallas Cowboys career leader in passing yards and completions, passing efficiency and completion percentage.

Today, he continues in his involvement in football as a television analyst, and he also focuses on the Troy Aikman Foundation which partners with Garth Brooks to build interactive playrooms in children's hospitals across the country. Let's take a look.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

One of the hallmarks of all these honorees has been humility and Troy Aikman is fairly successful in his NFL career indeed.

Remembering Troy Aikman tonight, welcome from the University of California, Los Angeles, director of athletics, Dan Guerrero. *(Applause)*

Dan, congratulations to the university and Troy Aikman. I talked to Troy back in December, and I know he would have very much liked to have been here. He understands how important this event is and he said he was going to send you in his stead. Someone said you don't look like Troy Aikman. Can you throw like Troy Aikman?

Mr. Dan Guerrero: I can very much do so. *(Laughter)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: I know you want to say something on behalf of Troy.

Mr. Dan Guerrero: Troy Aikman sends his regrets in not being able to be here this evening. But he is so grateful to the Association for bestowing this honor on him.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Pass on to him that we are indeed honored to honor him this evening. Congratulations. *(Applause)*

Our next Top Ten winner is from Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Kayla Shull.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please welcome from Clarion University of Pennsylvania, associate athletic director, Wendy Snodgrass, and Ms. Kayla Shull. *(Applause)*

Congratulation to you. I think one of the very interesting aspects of getting to be a Top Ten Honoree is to talk to them about having this enormous success as an athlete in the future. Watching this and the obvious joy you take in what you do, how did you become inspired to study speech pathology? What do you hope to do with this in the future?

Ms. Kaya Shull: Well, actually, I was very blessed, you know, by God, because I originally didn't think I would be able to swim because I have a hearing disability, so I had major constructive surgery to my inner ear. So, it was originally planned that I wasn't going to be able to swim at all in college. I worked with my doctors and my coaches, you know, and I was able to have that opportunity to swim. Just throughout my experience, I realized I wanted to help kids in a different way, not necessarily straight hearing itself, but in a way that involved hearing aspects. So, I took speech pathology in order to give back in the same way that a lot of people blessed me and gave me opportunity to stand in front of you here today. I am very thankful for that, and I just want to return that favor and instill that in many people's lives. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: We are told nothing great is accomplished without passion, and it is clear with the passion that you are bringing into great things into your future to help young people. Congratulations.

Ms. Kayla Shull: Thank you. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Next up, from Concordia University, St. Paul, the Top Ten winner, Ellie Duffy.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please join me in welcoming from Concordia University, St. Paul, director of athletics Tom Rubbelke with Ellie Duffy. *(Applause)*

Congratulations, Ellie to you. People should know, obviously, you are extraordinary successful as a student-athlete and you are now working on a master's degree in biostatistics a very important field of study. What are you hoping to do with it in the future?

Mr. Ellie Duffy: I think it is because of the opportunity it has to work in research. I would like to work in the medical research on clinical trials and really be able to be a part of something in making discoveries that potentially have a great impact on other people.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: I am sure you will have that drive and competitiveness that allows you to be successful in that field. Our thanks to you and congratulations and good luck. *(Applause)*

Our next Silver Anniversary Award winner is Rodney Peete. Rodney led the University of Southern California football team to a Pac-10 title and a trip to the Rose Bowl. Following his career with the NFL, he co-founded the HollyRod Entertainment along with his wife, Holly Robinson to generate funds to fight Parkinson's disease, support children suffering from autism, and improve the quality of life for those in need.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please welcome from the University of California senior associate director of athletics, Steve Lopes, with Rodney Peete. *(Applause)*

Congratulations, Rodney, to you also.

Mr. Rodney Peete: Thank you.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: I know that in the work that you and Holly and your foundation do, you can talk a lot about values and the importance of hope. What is that message that you deliver to parents who like you and Holly are first struck with that terrible news; how does that message help them?

Mr. Rodney Peete: Well, hope is what it is all about. Our journey, we got a diagnosis at three-years old from a developmental pediatrician. She told us that our son would never speak, our son would never play team sports, our son would never go to a main stream school and would never look you in the eye and say "I love you." Our son would never do countless other things, and to tell that to an athlete like me and to tell that to a woman who has been an actress for so many years, that has been fighting and struggling, that didn't sit well with us. We rolled up our sleeves. I have got to give it all to my wife, who rolled up her sleeves first and got on board and said "We are not going to accept this," we didn't. I look at my son today. He is 16. Rodney stand up right now. He is 16 years old and he has played basketball team sports, graduated from middle school, and he is in the 10th grade. He is very astute musically and looks you in the eye every single day and says, "I love you." *(Applause)*

That is the most important thing. And for those families that don't think there is a light at the end of the tunnel, we are here to tell you that there is and we are fighting for you. So, we are a living proof example that there is light at the end of the tunnel, and if we work together anything is possible. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: From your line there, you have more than paid your debt in the power of love. Congratulations.

Mr. Rodney Peete: Thank you very much. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Our next Top Ten winner from the University of North Dakota, Jocelyne Lamoureux.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

From the University of North Dakota, please welcome President Robert Kelly with Jocelyne Lamoureux. *(Applause)*

I have got to say you are the first woman that drew a couple of oohs and aahs out there. This is a tough crowd to impress by the way. So, you talked about the little two-year old girl on skates for the first time, and now you are heading off representing the United States in the Olympics. Talk about your thoughts as you think about that two-year old and now what you are getting prepared to do.

Ms. Jocelyne Lamoureux: I mean, I think as you guys know, that is the platform for sports and you know how great the opportunity is to represent your country and go on and try to win a gold medal. That is the goal. My coach is here somewhere.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: You have a lot of competition.

Ms. Jocelyne Lamoureux: You want to win a gold medal. But the bigger picture is what you guys have done and that is to impact the people around you and have a bigger purpose than the wins and losses.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Joyclene, you have the ability to represent the United States, but more importantly you have the character to represent the United States. Congratulations and good luck to you in the games.

Ms. Jocelyne Lamoureux: Thank you. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Next up, from the University of Alabama, Barrett Jones.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please join me in welcoming from the University of Alabama, associate athletic director for sports services Kevin Almond, along with Barrett Jones. *(Applause)*

Barrett, congratulations. I am making a living out of congratulating Barrett. The reason for that is he mentioned the William V. Campbell's Trophy. I am chairman of the committee that chose him, and I can tell you it was not a difficult decision at all, because of what you had accomplished. I am going to follow you around and introduce you.

Mr. Barrett Jones: Thank you.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: You know you have been so involved in this notion of giving back to your community and mission trips from the sixth grade on and clearly the University of Alabama gave you a significant platform. Being in NFL, how does that help you think in terms of your mission to give back?

Mr. Barrett Jones: Well, thank you, Jack. I first and foremost would like to thank the NCAA for such a great week. It has been an incredible experience to get to meet the other winners. That was awesome. I was always under the impression a week like this would be considered an impermissible benefit, but the NCAA paid for the whole thing, so it is pretty awesome. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: He was looking for the private jet to bring him in.

Mr. Barrett Jones: That's right. But to answer your question, I am of the belief that every student-athlete in his college is a role model, the only thing is how you are going to use that role model. I always wanted to be a guy who would use that in a positive way. It is not really a more special feeling than to help somebody else, especially when you can help a kid or do something for them that you get a big smile. That is a special feeling. I feel very honored that I am a guy that has got the experience and in the position where people would want to take a picture of me or get an autograph. It is such a neat thing to be able to do that. I feel that God has called me to do

things like that overseas and go on mission trips. I am actually leaving for India on Tuesday, and I plan on continuing that in the future, and this is something I feel like I have been called for. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: You have done it marvelously, and we are pleased and honored to have you here with us tonight. Congratulations and good luck with everything you do. *(Applause)*

Our final Silver Anniversary Honoree, Dara Torres, was a two-sport varsity letter winner at the University of Florida, completing in swimming for four years and playing volleyball for her fifth year of school. The first and only U.S. swimmer to compete in five Olympic Games. She was the first woman in history to swim in the Olympics past the age of 40, and in 2008 became the oldest swimmer ever to compete in the Olympic Games. Today she works as a TV sports commentator and a motivational speaker. Ladies and gentlemen, let's take a look at the career of Dara Torres.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Please welcome from the University of Florida assistant to the athletic director and former swimming coach Skip Foster, along with Dara Torres. *(Applause)*

Dara, congratulations to you.

Ms. Dara Torres: Thank you, Jack.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: As you said, we know there is no greater pressure than the pressures on middle-aged people. We can be relentless.

Ms. Dara Torres: They push me and that is good.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: You talked there about talking with people and especially in your motivational speeches. I suspect that some of the people that come and listen to you are looking at you as to how does she balance being a mother and a wife, and an inspirational speaker and all the charity work you do? I suspect they would almost find it daunting to do? How do you get through that and convey some sort of message about what they can do in terms of the balance in their lives?

Ms. Dara Torres: Well, it is funny. I never expected to go back and swim again when I was pregnant with my daughter. I wanted to exercise and I got back into it. I started coaching three weeks after I delivered my daughter and I did pretty well. So, I got the bug again and decided to swim. I remember my first week, when I decided to swim, I hired a babysitter to watch my daughter. How am I going to balance being a mom and doing it well, and all the other things going on in my life? That first week, I remember getting out of practice probably 10 or 15 minutes and call the babysitter and asked, "Did she poop; did she pee; did she do something?" Finally, the babysitter stopped answering the phone. I really like to work with parents out there as an inspiration to figure out what is the best balance to being a mom and do what I love to do. I think it is a tribute to those out there that helps me to be able to find that balance that works for my daughter and I.

Master of Ceremonies Ford: You have been an inspiration to us of middle-age and even older and I am sure everybody else out there. Dara, congratulations to you, and it is a pleasure to have you with us. *(Applause)*

PRESENTATION OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD

Now, we come to the final award presentation of the evening, the Theodore Roosevelt Award, that is known as the highest honor that the NCAA may convey on an individual. To present this award, please welcome Lou Ann Simon, the chair of the NCAA Executive Committee.

Executive Committee Chair Simon: What an awesome evening. It is really truly inspirational and a pleasure to be here with you and enjoy all these stories, and I'm sure the Awards Committee could have many,

many more stories that could have been on the stage tonight. It is my pleasure tonight to present the final award tonight, the Teddy Award name after President Theodore Roosevelt for his concern of the conduct of intercollegiate athletics in the formation of the NCAA in 1906. This award is given to an individual who "Removed discrimination in athletics in college and the tension to the physical well-being thereafter." They have been important factors in the development of national significant achievements. Our award recipient tonight is Billy Mills. He used his dedication to rise above hardship and crime, and became a record holder Olympian, a business man and a humanitarian. A champion with the Native American community is an inspiration to all of us.

(Whereupon, the video is played at this time.)

Presenting the award to Billy Mills is from the University of Kansas. Please join me in welcoming from the University of Kansas, Billy Mills.

(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolong standing ovation)

Mr. Billy Mills: Well, what a beautiful evening. Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be in the presence of great sports leaders and leaders of academia, but I have to say I am humbled to be considered a colleague of tonight's honorees. Your sports performances have inspired many, but when I sat and listened, and watched your passion for humanitarian deeds I was taken on a journey, a powerful journey to the bottom of my soul. As I watched each of you honorees tonight, you challenged me to be a better person, you challenged the audience to be better people. For that, I thank you. For that, we thank you. To quote Albert Einstein, "Few are those who can see with their own eyes and feel with their own hearts." Sports properly taught, we can empower our youth not only in the world of sports, but academically to be among those few who can see with our own eyes and feel with our own hearts. We have experienced it this evening. Sports helped me in so many ways. As a young person, sports helped me meet the wing of change that continued to occur in our rapidly changing world, and helped me take advantage of opportunities that ultimately is presented and awaits all of us. I was fortunate to have great leaders, great coaches, great teachers and mentors throughout my sports career. I was blessed and I am still blessed with brothers and sisters who loved to challenge me to constantly seek the horizon and potentially kept me from falling into the pocket of dreams. At the University of Kansas, I met a young art student. I immediately fell in love. Eventually, she fell in love. In ten days, we will celebrate our 52nd wedding anniversary. *(Applause)*

My journey through sports, my journey through life is her journey, our journey together. Every day I experience the strength and sacredness of family, and we are blessed to be citizens of the United States of America. Patricia and I have had the opportunity to travel worldwide. I have gone to 160 different countries. Together we continue to seek the horizon of the future. As we also continually promote a true sense of global unity through the dignity, through the character, through the beauty of the universe, which to me is not only the theme of sports but of athletics. For more important is the future in these times. I humbly accept the honor being bestowed upon me. On behalf of my family, on behalf of many friends here in the United States of America, and a multitude of friends and friendships that we have blossomed over the years throughout the world, blossomed simply because of one single denominating factor, we all have one thing in common called sport. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Master of Ceremonies Ford: Congratulations, Billy, again to you. I said to you at the beginning of the evening that this would be very special celebration, and I am sure that now you all understand why that is. We have recognized a truly unparalleled group of high achievers tonight. Our inspiration winners perform professionally and personally. And now I would like have all our 2014 honorees to please stand. In every aspect of your lives you have dramatically and tangibly demonstrated the attributes that make the NCAA student-athlete experience unique: Learning, balance, spirit, community, fair play and perhaps the most important as we have seen, character.

We are blessed to honor you this evening and proud to recognize you as examples as what we all strive to be. So, now as the honorees and their family members make their way into the foyer for the dessert, please join me in one final round of applause for our 2014 Honors Award recipients. *(Applause)*

Again, I want to invite all of you to go outside and circulate with tonight's winners and

spend some time at the dessert, and chat with them on behalf of the NCAA.

I want to thank you once again for letting me join you and we look forward to seeing you next year in Washington, D.C. Have a good night.

(Whereupon, the honors celebration was adjourned t 9:20 o'clock p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS
of the
NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
DIVISION II FORUM BUSINESS SESSION

Saturday, January 18, 2014
MARRIOTT MARQUIS & MARINA
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

SATURDAY MORNING SESSION

JANUARY 18, 2014

(The Division II Forum of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held on Saturday, January 18, 2014, at the Marriott Marquis & Marina, Marriott Hall, San Diego, California, was called to order at 8:00 o'clock a.m., with Chairman Pat O'Brien West Texas A&M University, presiding.)

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: To get us revved up for this morning's business meeting we're going to start off with an inspirational video this morning so watch the screens.

(Whereupon, a video was played.)

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: I'm Pat O'Brien, president of West Texas A&M University, and Chair of the Division II Presidents Council. The 2014 Division II business session will come to order. We thought it would be appropriate to begin the business session with an inspiring video of why we're all here. As we all know, Division II athletics provides for many of our students a life-changing event. UNC Pembroke wrestler Mike Williams is a prime example of this. He's a prime example of what we talk about when we talk about Life in the Balance. On the mat he became a national champion. He earned his degree and set postgraduate goals. He also gives back community service. He overcame adversity and developed as a person, a first-generation student. It's interesting to know Division II has the highest proportion of first-generation students and there are inspiring stories like Mike's on every one of our campuses and it's because of the work that you do. It's because of your dedication. It's because of your coaching and your mentorship and your providing the resources necessary for these individuals to be successful. Now, to start off today's proceedings I'd like to first welcome and recognize our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Would you please stand. As I said the other night, this is a remarkable group of women and men. They dedicate themselves to helping make the Division better. They have classes to attend. They have sports to participate in, practices, but they are willing to provide of their own time on their campus SAACs, conference SAACs, and national SAAC. They are, as I said the other day, the voice of the customer and in a sense they are our conscience. We want to thank them for all that they do. We know that you're going to be engaged this morning in the legislative process. I'm sure we're going to hear from some of you. I also want to tell you and compliment them on the work that they do with Make-a-Wish Foundation. This past year, 2012-2013, through their leadership and the leadership on our campuses, over \$517,000 was raised for Make-a-Wish. That's \$78,000 more than ever had been raised for Make-a-Wish. Over the life of the association with Make-a-Wish over \$3 million has been collected by these young men and women and that \$3 million has helped so many people. As we begin today's business session, I would like for the other officers of the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council to stand and be recognized as I introduce you. President Council Vice Chair, President Tom Haas, Grand Valley State University from Region 3. Tom will move from Vice Chair of the Presidents Council next time I hit this gavel on this table to become Chair. I roll off. President Judith Bense, where is Judith, is she out here, President at University of West Florida. There she is over here by Microphone No. 5, she's going to be the new Vice Chair for the Presidents Council. Management Council Chair, Bob Boerigter, Commissioner of the MidAmerica Intercollegiate Athletics Association. Thank you, Bob. Management Council, Vice Chair, Karen Stromme, Senior Women's Administrator, University of Minnesota-Duluth and member of the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference, way over there. Karen is going to move up to the Chair of the Management Council. Additionally, I would like to recognize the outgoing members of the Division II

Management Council and Presidents Council. These representatives have done a terrific job over the past couple of years and I've gotten to become very good friends with them. I would like for these individuals to stand and be recognized as I call out your name. Clint Bryant, Director of Athletics, Georgia Regents University, at-large representative from the Peach Belt conference. Clint is all the way over there. Brenda Cates, Athletic Representative, University of Mount Olive, representing Conference Carolinas; Jim Naumovich, Commissioner, Great Lakes Valley Conference; Erin O'Connell, Senior Women's Administrator and Director of Athletics, Seattle Pacific University, representing the Great Northwest Athletic Conference; And our Chair, Management Council, Bob Boerigter. Also if individuals are planning to retire, we know sometimes our Boards make our decisions for us, but those who are planning to retire, if you would stand and be recognized. Thank you. We appreciate all your efforts and contributions and we look forward to hearing what you do in the next stage of your life. I would also like to take this opportunity to introduce Paul Engelmann, Faculty Athletic Representative, University of Central Missouri, who will serve today as our parliamentarian. Paul had the misfortune of being in the Ph.d. program in Oklahoma State with me back in '71 or something or another. I don't know when it was. Additionally, members of the Division II Governance Staff and the Academic and Membership Affairs Staff are with us here today. They are here to answer whatever questions we may have about any of the legislation that's before us. I want to thank you. If you guys could stand. As is required by our NCAA Constitution, we would like to give you an update as to what has taken place this past year and discuss some of the few key future priorities that we have, and so I ask president Tom Haas, President Grand Valley State University, to come to the podium.

DELEGATE TOM HAAS (*Grand Valley State University*): Thank you, Pat. I think if I could stay here and read through some notes to stay on track for the rest of the morning as well but I'm Tom Haas, President of Grand Valley State University, as Pat said. I'm the current Vice Chair of Division II Presidents Council. As we begin today's business session we would like to share with you some of the items of interest from the Division. The first update I would like to give you concerns the Division II strategic plan and the focus group that has been meeting to review and update the current plan, which runs through 2015. When the results of the Division II census were analyzed, it was determined that the Division should review the different programs and initiatives reflected in the current strategic plan to determine if they are representative of the direction that the Division II membership indicated that it would like to see the Division go. A focus group was formed consisting of Planning and Finance Committee members and other athletic representatives within the Division. Although the focus group is still fairly early in its discussions, it has agreed that the five goals of the current strategic plan are indeed very reflective and relevant of the Division II identity and philosophy and should remain the same. Changes in some of the terminology, however, within the plan will be made to better reflect outcomes or those desired results that we want as a Division. These then include changing the term 'goal' to 'strategic positioning outcome' or SPO, changing the current term 'priorities' to 'strategies' and changing 'action steps' to 'tactics or programs.' SPO areas will be arranged alphabetically so that no one area is deemed more important than another because they all are together very reflective of our identity and philosophy. Additionally, this plan will have a longer life span than the previous two plans, a six-year duration with a mid-period review. So if the plan is approved in 2015, it will be in effect until 2021, with a mid-period review occurring in 2018. My next update to you concerns the Division II budget. As you will recall, the Division II Planning and Finance Committee agreed to increase the per diem amount from \$90 to \$95 for the '13-'14 season. This \$5 increase in per diem amounts increases the Division II championships expenditures by \$331,000. And for the '14-'15 the per diem amount will again increase by \$5 from 95 to 100, again increasing the championships expenditure by \$331,000. These two per diem increases help offset institutional expenses for national championships. In addition, in December, the Division once again sent a supplemental distribution check in the amount of \$3,559 to every eligible active Division member -- Division II member institution. This practice seems to be the norm instead of the exception but I can tell you from the perspective of my institution it is most welcomed and never taken for granted. With the Division celebrating its 40th Anniversary in 2013 we decided that we would like to take some extra time and produce a yearbook that our Division II members would want to keep as a memento of the 40 years that the Division has been around. We are very proud of the fact that Gary Brown, former NCAA staff member and writer extraordinaire agreed to tackle the project for us. Each of you should have received the finished product when

you checked in at the registration. We have it right here and my wife went through it and she was very inspired by the stories that are in here. We hope that you are as proud of it as we are and thanks to Gary for his outstanding work. The convention yearbook contains important Committee reports and information about Division II. This yearbook assists us in conducting our business session more effectively by providing you written documents instead of Committee speeches. It also provides you with important news that you can share with your campuses and conference. I encourage you to share the yearbook with your entire staff not in attendance at this year's convention. I would like to highlight, just take a few minutes and highlight some of the information that's included in this year's 2013 Division II yearbook. The very special edition of NCAA Division II 40th Anniversary yearbook is worth reading cover to cover as it encompasses what truly makes Division II unique. This book takes a glimpse into the past, the present and the future of Division II, as well as many of the people and events that have set the Division on its current course. Readers can review 40 years of national champions, individual and team records, and, of course, reflect on all of the Division's accomplishments in 2013. What is particularly unique about this yearbook is the celebration of former student-athletes, you will find a diverse group of former student-athletes, one male, one female, from each Division II conference, that make up the Division II 40th Anniversary tribute team which was announced earlier this year. Division II athletics paved the way for future doctors, not-for-profit foundation founders, astronauts, principals, university presidents, professional athletes, entrepreneurs and celebrities and the list goes on and on. Overall, Division II athletics develops outstanding future leaders so please be sure to enjoy this incredible publication. Thank you, Pat, that concludes my report and thank you, sir, on behalf of all of us for your service over these last two years as our Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you, Tom. As you can see a lot of good work has been done in Division II over this past year. And, Tom, thank you for your leadership as Vice Chair and also as Chair of the Planning and Finance Committee. Thank you. Okay, now, from this point on I have to stay with the script. They won't let me get off of it, sorry. We need to take just a few minutes to review the voting process we use in Division II at the NCAA Convention. Some votes will be done by paddle, some proposals are designated for roll call, where we will use the voting units. Let me remind you how to cast a vote using the particular voting units. All voting delegates should have a voting unit and a smartcard. The smartcard should be inserted into the unit, noting the direction of the arrows, until you reach the red line on the card. When the card is inserted correctly, you will see a welcome message. When it is time to conduct a roll call vote, either press the No. 1 for "yes" or the No. 2 for "no" on your key pad. It is very important that if you do not wish to vote on a proposal you press No. 3 on your key pad to abstain. When you abstain, your institution will be noted as present but not voting. Check your response in the display screen on your key pad. There is no enter key required. If you want to change your vote, use the C key to clear and then enter the new vote. The last number you press prior to the voting window closing will be your registered vote. Your key pad doesn't have to be pointed in any particular direction, we'll pick it up. Went off script. You will be allowed approximately 30 seconds to cast your vote. Once discussion on a particular proposal is completed, I will say, It is now time to decide. Please cast your vote by pressing the No. 1 button for "yes," the No. 2 button for "no" or the No. 3 button to abstain. We then will wait approximately 30 seconds to say, The polls will be closing in five seconds. Any votes cast after I say, The polls are now closed, will not be registered. If your electronic voting unit malfunctions or displays an error message, please find a representative of the Membership Committee or proceed to the voting pit to my left so that they can assist you. If there is a malfunction you will have to complete a declaration form declaring the correct and complete voting action for your institution or conference. These forms are available in the voting pit. Please note that we have five representatives from our Division II Membership Committee available to assist you if you have any problems your voting units. I encourage you to find these people if you need assistance. I would like now to identify the voting helpers so when I call your name out please stand so that the delegates can see where you're located. Erin O'Connell from the Great Northwest Athletic Conference is to my right in the back section. Right by 7 over here. Kaye Crook from Conference Carolinas is to my far left in the front, by 9. That's in the back, not the front. Dan Mara from the Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference is to my right and in the front. Bob Hogue from the Pac-West Conference is to my left back over here between 6 and 10. And Sue Willey from the Great Lakes Valley Conference is in front of me in the back section, back over here. We also have Jim Watson, West

Liberty University, who is seated in the voting pit to my left. Jim, standing up now. Jim will work with the voting technicians to assist you if there are technical problems that need to be resolved. Those are the members of the Voting Committee this year so please find one of them if you're having some difficulty. Like in previous year, we are using the large video screens to project voting information. Voting results will be provided immediately for all electronic vote calls. We will display the roll call vote results on the large screen and make an announcement regarding the vote tally after we close the polls and before we proceed to the next proposal. Now, if your travel schedules require you to leave before the business session has concluded, please make sure that you take your voting unit, smartcard and paddle with you and turn them back in at the voting table in the back out where the food was. We ask that you not hand it off to some other individual to vote for you. Other institutions can't vote for your institution. Other conferences can't vote for your conference. Before we start our official voting we need to conduct a couple of test votes to ensure that your voting units are working properly. If you have not done so already, please find your voting unit and your smartcard and insert your smartcard into the voting unit. All right, for the first test vote please press the No. 1 for the "yes" button on your voting unit. Press the "yes" button now so that we can see that it's working. While we're checking the units we've got a very, very special award to present, the Division II award of excellence. The Division II Community Engagement Award began in 2008 and was presented to the Northern Michigan University for its Fall Sports Kick-off Event. Likewise, in 2010 Division II presented its first Division II Game Environment Award to the University of West Florida for its Argonaut Spirit of Challenge. Both of these awards have served the Division well since their inception but it was time to up the ante and we've created a more special award as a result that will encompass both of these awards and all that Division II stands for. The Division II Award of Excellence was created for 2014, combining the two Division II identity awards that previously recognized community engagement and game environment into a single annual award with larger prizes and prestige for member conferences or institutions. The annual award recognizes the very best across Division II when it comes to community engagement, game environment and the development of student-athlete leadership. This year each conference winner was awarded \$500. In addition, the Selection Committee chose a third-place winner, who will receive the \$500 conference prize, plus an additional \$500 for its third-place finish. The third-place prize goes to Concordia College (*New York*) for its annual Jim-My-Say-Egh game, which honors the spirit of Jimmy and helps us get closer to finding a cure for cancer. Congratulations, Concordia College. The second prize winner, who will receive the \$500 conference prize plus an additional \$750 for its second prize finish goes to Notre Dame College for its 40 days of Lent, 40 days of service, where the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee pledged to complete 40 days of service throughout the 40 days of Lent, with the help of Notre Dame College community. Congratulations, Notre Dame College. The grand prize winner, who will receive the \$500 conference prize, plus an additional \$1,000 for its first-place finish, is Lindenwood University. Lindenwood's entry, A Sellout for Sterling, tapped into the emotional support for a Lindenwood football player, Sterling Thomas, who suffered a life-changing spinal cord injury while playing football at the college. The Sellout for Sterling, culminated in the first sellout basketball game at Lindenwood. Please join me in welcoming the President of Lindenwood University, James Evans, and the Director of Athletics, John Creer, up to the stage to accept their first prize trophy. Congratulations.

MR. JAMES EVANS: I want to thank John Creer and the Athletic Department at Lindenwood University for the great effort that they put forth in the Sellout for Sterling initiative and of course it's all about Sterling and his family, 20 some of the greatest people on earth. He's a courageous young man with a great future. But we really want to appreciate as well Division II for all your support, MIAA conference in particular, but we received contributions and prayers and well wishes for Sterling from all over the conference and that's so meaningful. We'll display this trophy very appreciatively and proudly in perpetuity and we'll never forget what it means. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Again, congratulations. As you can see we had some problems with some of the units. None of the institutions' units were bad, it's just the conference offices. Go figure. I'm supposed to say here that the first test vote was successful. It was by and large. So for the delegates we'll go to the second test. Now, for the second test please press the No. 2 or the "no" button on your voting unit so that we can

confirm that it works. Please press the No. 2 or the “no” button. Press it now. While we’re taking this test vote we also want to do another recognition. Georgia Regents University received a prestigious NCAA Diversity and Inclusion Award on Thursday from the Minority Opportunities and Inclusion Committee. I first want to take a moment to congratulate Georgia Regents University President Ricardo Azziz on this impressive association-wide honor. But there are a lot of other great things going on at Georgia Regents as well. In December Athletic Director Clint Bryant hosted a Division II military summit, bringing together military leaders with NCAA and regional Division II athletic leadership or brainstorm session to grow partnerships between military communities and Division II campuses. Parenthetically, going off script again, I’d like to add that this idea of this partnership of NCAA Division II institutions with the military is an outcome of a brainstorming session that we had this past July at our Student-Athlete Advisory Council joint meeting with the Management Council, so, again, congratulations to our student-athletes. Many of our institutions and alums are already going above and beyond in partnering athletics with the military. As a division we strive to follow their lead and take these partnerships to a new level moving forward. Let’s take a look.

(Whereupon, a video is played.)

CHAIRMAN PAT O’BRIEN: The second test was successful with the exception of these folks over here. Just to let you know what’s going on. They are making up new smartcards for the commission offices and they are testing them at the same time. If a test one and test two went well for the institutional delegates we don’t have to do a test three. So we’ll get into the voting procedure. As a reminder, Roberts Rules of Order provides that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization’s own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such legislative requirements and procedures. Several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of the Official Notice. In addition, you will find in your Official Notice several appendices in the blue pages that list procedural information that may be of assistance to you. NCAA Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members and to expedite our work as delegates. I will not take the time to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to ensure fairness, but I will remind the delegates that we fully intend to apply these procedures throughout our business session this morning. There are certain procedures we employ in attempting to use our time wisely and efficiently, and let me briefly review those. As stated, we will use the voting machines for roll call votes; all other votes will be paddle vote. Roll call votes were designated by the Presidents Council for those proposals where it is important to create an historic record on how each Division II school and conference votes on the issues. Yes, like the NCAA, we collect your electronic data. I will attempt to eyeball as many paddle votes as possible, calling for a machine count only when the votes appear to be too close to call. Although the delegates have a right to call for it, I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a machine vote count unless one seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue. If a delegate intends to debate an issue during the business session, we ask that you be at one of the microphone locations and be prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded, or as soon as the previous speaker has concluded his or her remarks. The microphone number will be used to recognize speakers. So if you’re standing at, say, 7, I’ll say Microphone 7, that’s the recognition of you. Delegates will be limited to speak to a single motion not more than twice. If I see no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible. The voting and speaking privileges for NCAA conventions are set forth in NCAA legislation and are summarized in Appendix I, which is located on page No. 223 of your Official Notice. I would ask that you identify yourself by name and your institution or affiliation whenever you address the convention. Those delegates wearing convention lanyards that are red, blue or green are permitted to speak. Those with other colors or visitors, you may not participate other than as observers. As a reminder, the speeches made during today’s business session for each proposal creates an historic record that becomes important for research regarding the legislative intent of the 2014 voting delegates. The annual convention proceedings will serve as the official record of this business session and your remarks will be included in these proceedings. Let me also briefly review the Window of Reconsideration opportunity. After we complete the consideration of the all 24 Division II proposals, we will pause for approximately three minutes for people to organize for the period of reconsideration. I will call for a motion to reconsider any of the proposals that have been voted on. We will verify that the motion maker did vote on the prevailing side during our initial debate. We ask that all motions to

reconsider occur during this Window of Reconsideration. Also please note that some proposals have immediate effective dates or an alternative effective date for implementation that is prior to August 1, 2014. For such proposals, the immediate effective date or the alternative effective date must be considered first, followed by a vote on the merits of the proposal. If the immediate effective date or the alternative effective is defeated and the proposal is adopted, the effective date will then be August 1, 2014. We have a court reporter here today to prepare a transcript of this business session, so I, again, remind you, identify yourself before you speak and identify your affiliation. The 2014 NCAA Convention Official Notice, which you should have received in November, includes all of the legislative proposals pertinent to today's business session. This again is the Official Notice. In Appendix A (*the blue pages*) in the Official Notice, pages 109-110, you will find a list and the order of the 24 legislative proposals that will be considered during this Division II business session. I would also like to call your attention to the Procedural Issues Memo (*green sheet*) handed out this morning and I saw some in the back. This memo highlights procedural issues related to the Division's legislative proposals. We will meet until we complete all of our voting and get through our business items this morning. Our first business item this morning is to approve the Official Notice format. If we vote to accept the Official Notice, we will vote on the proposals in the order in which they appear in the notice. I also want to point out that by adopting the Official Notice, you will have approved the emergency legislation adopted by the Presidents Council in Appendix B (*pages 111 through 114*) incorporations of interpretations in Appendix C (*pages 115 through 122*) and the non-controversial amendments in Appendix D (*pages 123 to 208*). These amendments all have been approved by the Presidents Council and Management Council during the past 12 months, and we will not discuss any of them individually unless you move to do so. I will now ask for someone to make a motion to adopt the Official Notice and the printed order of proposals so that we may proceed with our work. After such a motion, we then can consider any motions to reorder proposals. Do I have such a motion? I have a motion. A second? I have a second. Okay. It is now -- no discussion on this? No discussion. It is now time for our paddle vote on the motion to adopt the Official Notice and printed order of proposals. All in favor, please raise your paddles; thank you, all opposed, please raise your paddle; thank you; abstentions, thank you. The Official Notice and printed order of procedures -- of proposals are approved. This year the Division II Presidents Council has identified proposals Nos. 1 through 8 as the consent package and they are intended to be voted on as group. We're now ready to begin our consideration of the legislative proposals. We will start on page No. 3 of the Official Notice with the consent package, Proposals No. 1 through 8. As we begin, I would like to remind to you to please state your name and institution or affiliation for the record when you are recognized by the Chair at one of the numbered microphones. Microphone 8.

DELEGATE ED MATEJKOVIC (*Wester Chester University of Pennsylvania*): Dr. O'Brien, Ed Matejkovic, Director of Athletics, West Chester University of Pennsylvania. I would like to move that Proposal No. 2014-8 be withdrawn from the consent package.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: It is. Microphone 6.

DELEGATE MARK LINDER (*University of North Alabama*): Mark Linder, University of North Alabama. I'd like to request that 2014-3 be pulled.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: It is. So what we will do is first vote on the consent agenda, which now consists of proposals No. 1, 5, 6 and 7. Then after we deal with the consent agenda we will have paddle votes for proposals 3 and 8. 1, 2. 2 is left off on here. So 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, are now in the consent agenda. Microphone 3.

DELEGATE BOB BOERIGTER (*MidAmerica Intercollegiate Athletic Association*): I'm Bob Boerigter from the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association and a member of the Management Council. On behalf of the Management Council, I move Proposals No. 2014-1, 2014-2, 2014-4, 2014-5, 2014-6 and 2014-7 as the consent package.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE BOB BOERIGTER (*MidAmerica Intercollegiate Athletic Association*): Each of these proposals was placed in the consent package because of the nature of the changes being proposed. Each of these six proposals is considered without controversy. It is appropriate to vote on the six proposals as a package.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Any further discussion? Hearing none, we call the question. All in favor, please raise your paddles, thank you; all opposed, please raise your paddles, thank you; abstentions, please raise your paddles, thank you. The consent agenda including 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 passes. We will now move to Proposal No. 3. Proposal No. 3 is a paddle vote with an effective 31 date of August 1, 2014. Microphone 1.

DELEGATE LARRY MARFISE (*University of Tampa*): President O'Brien, I'm Larry Marfise, Director of Athletics at the University of Tampa, a member of Management Council representing the Sunshine State Conference. I propose that we move Proposal No. 2014-3.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there a second? I have a second. Discussion?

DELEGATE LARRY MARFISE (*University of Tampa*): On behalf of the Management Council, I move the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 2014-3.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there a second? Okay.

DELEGATE LARRY MARFISE (*University of Tampa*): Proposal No. 2014-3 has an immediate effective date that was approved by the Presidents Council and Management Council via noncontroversial legislation. The immediate effective date will allow institutions to publish non-athletics institutional advertisements in high school and two-year college publications this spring.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Is there a second to the immediate effective date? I think we did that. All right. Discussion on the immediate effective date? All right. We're going to vote first paddle vote on the immediate effective date. If that does not pass then the default date, then we will vote on the motion itself. All in favor of the immediate effective date, please raise your paddles, thank you; all opposed, please raise your paddles, thank you; abstentions? The immediate effective date passes. Discussion on the motion?

DELEGATE LARRY MARFISE (*University of Tampa*): Current legislation does not permit an institution to place advertisements in high schools or two-year college athletics publications even if the advertisement does not include any information regarding the institution's athletic programming. Permitting an institution to place such an advertisement in athletics publications when the Athletic Department is not involved does not create a recruiting advantage. Division II admissions and university advancement officers are continually searching for creative and effective ways to drive enrollment and increase awareness about their institution. Permitting nonathletic institutional advertisements in high school or two-year college athletics publications provides institutions with a valuable platform for reaching prospective students in general, not just prospective student-athletes. In addition to providing further opportunity for institutional outreach, this proposal will also reduce the monitoring burden on compliance personnel who are not always consulted regarding the activities and advertising opportunities pursued by admissions and university development offices. Please join me and the Management Council in support of Proposal 2014-3. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 6.

DELEGATE MARK LINDER (*University of North Alabama*): Mark Linder, University of North

Alabama. I struggle with this legislation for a couple reasons. I understand it's permissive in nature but just because it's permissible doesn't mean it's beneficial to all of us. You start looking at taking advertisement out and gain programs for every high school in your region, making gain program advertisement out for every junior college in your region, I struggle with as a university the cost impact that could have on us because the minute we say no to one high school it will have an impact on our relationship with that high school. So for that reason I struggle with this legislation and I do wish that people would stand with me to oppose it.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Further discussion? Hearing no further discussion we call the question. This is a paddle vote. All in favor of this motion, please raise your paddles, thank you; all opposed, please raise your paddle, thank you; abstentions, thank you. Proposal 2414-3 passes. 35 We now move to Proposal No. 9 -- excuse me, Proposal No. 8. Proposal No. 8 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2014. Microphone 2.

DELEGATE JACQUELINE CARPENTER (*Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association*): President O'Brien Jacqueline Carpenter, Commissioner of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and member of the Management Council. On behalf of Management Council, I move Proposal No. 2014-8.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there a second? Second.

DELEGATE JACQUELINE CARPENTER (*Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association*): NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics manages the emerging sports for women programs, which is designated to explore participation and sponsorship interests of non-championship sports that might develop into championship sports. Of the nine sports on the original list four -- water polo, rowing, bowling and ice hockey -- grew to championship sports, while five failed to grow and remove from the emerging sports list by vote of the membership. To move a sport from the emerging sports list to an NCAA championship sport there must be a minimum of 40 sponsoring institutions; and the membership must seek legislative changes and funding for a championship, through the normal legislative and budget processes. NCAA legislation allows a sport to remain on the emerging sports list for 10 years or longer if it's showing steady progress for growth, per CWA policy and review. Women's rugby surpassed the 10-year mark on the emerging sports list in 2012. However, while sponsorship has been flat, Harvard started sponsoring the sport this academic year. In addition the 2006 -- the 2016 Olympics will sport rugby seven's for the first time. Additionally, a new organizational structure for women's collegiate rugby has recently been established with 145 member schools - the American Collegiate Rugby Association. ACRA, sponsored a national 15's championship this past December and will sponsor a seven's championship in the spring of 2014. This proposal, which is being considered by all three divisions, modifies the playing and practice season and sports sponsorship legislation for women's rugby to permit 15-a-side and/or seven-a-side format in light of the Olympic change and in reaction to the growth of interest in seven-a-side. The proposal also seeks to modify the competition-against-club-teams rule, modeled after current sand volleyball rules, to assist in the growth of the sport and to help institutions meet minimum contest requirements. Should rugby, women's rugby, fail to grow after these changes, it will be required to meet CWA policy requirements or legislation will be proposed to remove the sport from the list for failure to grow. Please join me in support of Proposal No. 2014-8.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone 8.

DELEGATE ED MATEJKOVIC (*West Chester University of Pennsylvania*): Was there a second?

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Yes. **DELEGATE ED MATEJKOVIC** (*West Chester University of Pennsylvania*): Ed Matejkovic, West Chester University of Pennsylvania, Director of Athletics. I would like to ask my Division II colleagues at this point either abstain or vote no for this legislation for two reasons: No. 1, we have sponsored -- we're the only Division II institution in the country that sponsored rugby for the last four years successfully. We have 40, 45 women in our rugby program. It has been very successful. At this point we

have played 11 games every year and into the post season an additional four to five. This legislation increases the number of games played from 11 to 16 which will cause a financial hardship. The second issue is that our last year's schedule consisted of two NCAA rugby teams, Quinnipiac and Norwich, one a Division I institution, one a Division III institution, that were in our region and the rest of the contests were against club programs. This legislation will force us to begin to fly around the country to meet our minimum sponsorship requirements and I think it places an unfair burden on one institution that sponsors the sport and will have an opposite effect in our situation of maybe forcing us to go back to a club program again. I ask you to refrain from voting or vote no. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone 3.

DELEGATE CARMEN LEEDS (*Emporia State University*): Carmen Leeds, Emporia State University, Member of the Committee on Women's Athletes. As member of the Committee on Women's Athletics I ask for your support of proposal 2014-8. We believe adding seven D seven as an option of play along with the ability to play two club sport teams may help rugby grow. This proposed legislation does not require any changes to the current way an institution operates their sport. This proposed legislation will give current institutions options of play as well as provide new institution budgetary options and student interest options when considering to add women's rugby. The increase from 11 to 16 dates of competition is permissive legislation. You do not have to play 16. The minimum dates of competition remains at nine so institutions are not required to increase dates if funding is an issue. Consider the future of women's rugby and this proposed legislation to help increase the growth of women's rugby. Please vote yes for proposal 2014-8.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there any further discussion? Microphone 8.

DELEGATE ED MATEJKOVIC (*West Chester University of Pennsylvania*): Last chance. I have no problem with the addition of the seven's. I think that's a very good decision. I have a problem with the addition of the number of contests and the proposition of only counting two club teams to fulfill our schedule. It will be a financial burden on us to be able to continue our rugby program.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Further discussion? Hearing no further discussion I call the question. It is now time for our paddle vote on Proposal No. 8. All in favor, please raise your paddles, thank you; all opposed, please raise your paddles; abstentions. Thank you. This one is too close to call. So we are going to do a roll call vote. Okay. So it's now time to resolve Proposal No. 8. You're going to have to use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 for "yes," No. 2 for "no," No. 3 for abstention. Please cast your vote. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal 2014-8 is defeated. We move now to Proposal No. 9. Proposal No. 9 is a paddle vote with an effective date of August 1, 2014. Microphone 8.

DELEGATE TOM HAAS (*Grand Valley State University*): Good morning. I'm Tom Haas, President Grand Valley State University and proud member of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2014-9.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE TOM HAAS (*Grand Valley State University*): Division II's strategic positioning platform is focused on preparing student-athletes for future success. Current legislation regarding participation in promotional activities following enrollment limits the activities in which a student-athlete may participate, even when such activities are in no way connected to the student-athlete's involvement in intercollegiate athletics. For example, the limitations imposed by the current legislation preclude a musician from actively promoting his or her musical career while participating in intercollegiate athletics. In addition, a student-athlete who

aspires to be an author is unable to promote a book, the same way a business student is unable to promote his or her own business venture. Proposal No. 2014-9 will provide Division II students with additional opportunities to pursue success in areas outside of intercollegiate athletics. Current legislation regarding post enrollment modeling and non-athletically-related promotional activities is well intended, but it is broken. It permits a student-athlete to use his or her name or picture to promote the sale of a commercial product or service, provided that the individual does not endorse a commercial product or service. The contradictory nature of the legislation effectively precludes Division II student-athletes from participating in any modeling or non-athletically-related promotional activities. This proposal will provide new opportunities for our student-athletes while maintaining proper safeguards to ensure that such activities remain unrelated to athletics and the principles of amateurism remain intact. Please join me in support of the Proposal 2014-9. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Other discussion? Hearing no other discussion we call the question. It is now time for a paddle vote on Proposal No. 9. All in favor, please raise your paddles, thank you; all opposed, please raise your paddles, thank you; abstentions, thank you. Proposal 2414-9 passes. 44 Proposal No. 10, Proposal No. 10 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2014, for institutions making application to enter the membership process on February 1, 2015, and thereafter. Microphone No. 1.

DELEGATE ARTHUR KIRK (St. Leo University): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Arthur Kirk, president of St. Leo University, member of the Sunshine State Conference and also a member of the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2014-10.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE ARTHUR KIRK (St. Leo University): Thank you. Proposal 2014-10 is the culmination of the Division II Membership Committee's review of the membership process that began in November of 2011-2012. In its review the Committee concluded that the requirements and structure of the process needed to be further defined to reflect fully the philosophy of the Division related to membership. One of the Membership responsibilities is to serve as a gatekeeper for the Division. As such, the Committee seeks to identify institutions that distinguish themselves as premier candidates for membership by having a structure and the resources in place to support a Division II athletics program. The proposed amendments to this process will require institutions to be in full compliance with all Division II legislation following the first year of the process, which is consistent with the Committee's and the Division's philosophy. The proposed changes also provide institutions with the opportunity to become acclimated to operating as a Division II institution. Specifically, institutions in the membership process will have the ability to assess and revise its policies and procedure while being in full compliance with Division II legislation for a longer period prior to becoming fully active members. Additionally, requirements for select institutional personnel to attend specific meetings and events further defines the Committee's expectations for an institution seeking membership and codifies guidance that has previously been provided to institutions. As Division II, we pride ourselves on being a destination division. Proposal No. 2014-10 is an opportunity to define the requirements and expectations of institutions seeking membership in Division II further and ensures premier institutions are being considered for membership in the Division. For these reasons I encourage you to join me in support of proposal 2014-10.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there further discussion? Hearing no further discussion, call the question. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 2014-10. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal 2014-10 passes. 47 We'll consider now Proposal No. 11. Proposal No. 11 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2015. Microphone 4.

DELEGATE MIKE SCALES (Nyack College): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'm Mike Scales of

Nyack College in New York, a member of the Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference. On behalf of Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2014-11.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Second? I have a second.

DELEGATE MIKE SCALES (*Nyack College*): I serve as liaison for the Presidents Council of the Championships Committee. I've never seen a more conscientious and harder working committee as they diligently work towards fairness and objectivity. In 2011 a Championships Committee was charged with reviewing selective criteria that would determine methods that would encourage Division II schools to schedule in-region/nonconference competition. The Championships Committee felt it was important to engage in a national dialogue with the full Division II membership on this issue. They spent the last two years gathering feedback and ideas from the membership to develop recommendations. Proposal No. 2014-11 is the outcome of this membership-driven review. Proposal No. 2014-11 establishes a consistent set of selection criteria for all team sports that reflects the priorities of Division II and the Championships Committee. It also provides the Division II membership with clear guidance to assist in the development of competition schedules as institutions position themselves to compete for post-season berths. Additionally, the Championships Committee recognizes the need for sports to have a unique and specific criteria to address the nuances of each sport. As a result, the national governing sports committees will have the opportunity to identify up to three additional sport-specific selection criteria from an approved list. This list contains criteria that has been used previously by various sports committees in the selection process. Finally, the proposed -- this proposal has a delayed effective date of August 1, 2015. This will afford the Championships Committee time to engage in educational efforts with the membership and allow institutions to change their scheduling practices prior to the implementation of new selection criteria. For these reasons I encourage you to join me in support of Proposal No. 2014-11.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone 6.

DELEGATE MARK LINDER (*University of North Alabama*): Mark Linder, University of North Alabama. I'm a Division II product. I played Division II athletics. I was one of these student-athletes once upon a time. I came up through the compliance ranks as Assistant AD and now fortunate enough to be enrolled as athletic director at a fine Division II university. Yesterday I asked the question if regionalization was still our banner which we waved strongly and boldly because it's a tenant in which we stand on. I was told yes. I was told yes, it is. I was glad to hear that but then when I look at the criteria that was laid out by this Committee, it could be that one of eight, one of eight for a sports selection containing in-region play. To me that is not regionalization. To me the system needs to be improved and it can be improved better than what we have in front of us. I do appreciate the sense of wanting to become consistent and getting the best teams in the region to the post season. I, too, agree with that. But when my colleague says that they were given a charge and encouraged to find a way to encourage in-region and out-of-conference competition, this legislation fails in doing that. We have large conferences now that have started to schedule within themselves and will not play outside. That's not regionalization. You cannot -- you cannot compare institutions in one league to another if they don't play head to head. The system is faulty. It's broken. The point system that we see in front of us, it's better for me to go get an 0 and 10 team to play football at my place so I can get 13 points rather than go and play at a fine university like Grand Valley or Northwestern football on the road and losing. That doesn't give me any incentive to go play a quality institution. We have open dates and a lot of our sports, people in our region and outside of our region, and they will not play us. They say, we'll come play you in football for \$60,000. That's bordering on the line of extortion in my book. When we don't have open dates we cannot compare head to head. We don't get the best institutions in the post season. It's broken. Finally, I offer this up. If you want to fix the problem, you can set criteria that embraces regionalization in the banner that we wave, you can. Say 20 percent of your games must be in region outside your league. If not, you don't qualify for post season. That's pretty simple. For that reasons -- or those reasons I urge that you oppose this legislation. Let's do better, let's do better for our student-athletes and let's do better for ourselves.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone 4.

DELEGATE LISA SWEANY (*Armstrong Atlantic State University*): Thank you. Lisa Sweany, Athletic Director of Armstrong Atlantic State University, a member of the Championships Committee. On behalf of the Championships Committee, I also want to speak in support of proposal 2014-11. Proposal No. 2014-11 increases consistency in selection criteria across all team sports while allowing each sport to have individualized optional selection criteria. This proposal will provide the membership with a foundation to better understand the principles of scheduling. Additionally, the Championships Committee acknowledges the need for more transparent selection criteria that is easier to understand. As a result, to support the implementation of Proposal No. 2014-11, the Committee is developing educational and training resources to create a better understanding of the Division II selection criteria terminology, selection process and final selection outcomes. This will assist in making the criteria clearer for institutions and for those serving in the committee structure. A standardized policies and procedures manual for selection criteria is also being refined to further explain the selection process and establish a framework for the membership related to selection criteria. This proposal, and the policy recommendations associated with it, appropriately address the feedback from the Division II membership related to selection criteria for NCAA championships and provides consistency for all sports. Please join me in support of Proposal No. 2014-11.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Any further discussion? Microphone 5.

DELEGATE NATE SALANT (*Gulf South Conference*): Good morning, Nate Salant, Commissioner of the Gulf South Conference. I've listened to what the University of North Alabama athletic director has had to say and it has triggered a thought and a concern, I guess. The concept of transparency and consistency, that's very, very important and I think all of us support that. But there is a secondary question here that he has brought to the table and it's something I think needs some more thought and that is we've seen statistically that if large conferences only play amongst themselves they have much better chances of getting more teams into the NCAA regional than if they play inter-conference, in-region competition. This is not good for regionalization and I ask the delegates to consider that. I don't know if that's a reason to vote against this proposal. I'm not in a position to say that for anyone else but I do see the concern and as a commissioner of a conference whose membership is constantly challenged to find in-region nonconference games and in a region where conferences are growing and will soon be at the point where they never have to play anyone outside of their own conference, how will you measure whether the third-place team in Conference A is better than the second-place team or third-place team in Conference B when there is no in-region play outside of conferences. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 6.

DELEGATE HERB REINHARD (*Valdosta State*): Herb Reinhard, Director of Athletics at Valdosta State. Dr. O'Brien, this legislation will probably pass but I would urge the Presidents Council, the Management's Council and the Championships Committee to take a hard look at where we're going in regards to regionalization. Mr. Linder is correct, in some areas of the country it's got significant problems and I'm frankly very concerned about the future of our championships if we don't acknowledge that there is a concern, that there are problems and take a good hard look at it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Any further discussion? Hearing none, I call the question. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 2014-11. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no," or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-11 passes. Proposal No. 12, Proposal No. 12 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2014. This is a membership sponsored proposal sponsored by the Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference, South Atlantic

Conference and the Sunshine State Conference. Do I have a motion? Microphone 3.

DELEGATE DAN MARA (*Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference*): Mr. Chair, Dan Mara, Commissioner of the Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference. On behalf of the South Atlantic Conference, Sunshine State Conference and the Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference, I move Proposal 2014-12.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE DAN MARA (*Central Atlantic Collegiate Conference*): Good morning, this proposal will alter Bylaw 17.3.6 to allow the basketball conference challenge exemption to be utilized every season rather than every three years. Initially it is important to note this is an effort to revamp dated legislation and make it more relevant to today's Division II. Since the conference challenge event was approved initially, landscape of Division II has changed drastically. Conferences have increased in size and that has led to many conferences playing in excess of 20 conference games. These expanded conference schedules reduce the chances for in-region/nonconference games, thus making the task of the respective Regional Advisory Committees all the more difficult. This proposal will allow for an increase in nonconference/in-region contests on an annual basis allowing the RACs to have vital head-to-head and common opponent data to use to determine the best selections for post-season play. This I am confident is the reason the proposal is supported by the Division II Championships Committee. The current legislation provides for every three-year exceptions; however, it is difficult to track when an exemption is used and if it is you'd ever -- only every three years. Approving this proposal will ease the burden on Regional Advisory Committees as well as conference and institutional compliance officers. Please remember, this does not create 58 the conference challenge. This proposal passed years ago. The Presidents Council and legislation committees have stated Life in the Balance concerns regarding the the 2014 proposal. The challenge exists currently and is utilized often. I believe these two elite committees just mentioned would not have allowed the challenge to continue after the 2010 Life in the Balance initiative was approved if they truly felt it was not in opposition to the balance we so strongly endorse. If the every three-year exemption has fit Life in the Balance, the annual exemption will also going forward. On behalf of the South Atlantic Conference, the Sunshine State Conference and Central Intercollegiate Conference, we urge you to support this membership crafted, membership proposed and membership sponsored proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone 8.

DELEGATE JAVIER CEVALLOS (*Kutztown University*): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Javier Cevallos, President of Kutztown University, member of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference, Member of the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I speak in opposition to proposal 2014-12. This proposed change is contrary to Division II's Life in the Balance initiative. Life in the Balance legislation, which was adopted by the membership in 2010 focused on reducing missed class time, missed study time and missed time away from campus for student-athletes. This was done through the adoption of legislation that changed the start dates for fall sports, reduced contests and dates of competition in 10 sports and identified a winter break period for student-athletes, athletic administrators, coaches and athletic trainers. This proposal would essentially permit institutions to add two basketball contests to its schedule each year, which negates the progress made by the contest reductions and other Life in the Balance changes impacting basketball. As previously noted, the Life in the Balance legislation established a mandatory winter break period which survey data shows us has been positively received by the student-athletes, administrators and even coaches. With the 60 establishment of the winter break period, this proposal would add two contests to an already shortened season. As a result, it will likely lead to increases in missed classes, missed class time, study time and time away from campus for basketball student-athletes. For this reason I encourage you to oppose Proposal No. 2014-12.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone 3.

DELEGATE FRANK KEENAN (*Mountain East Conference*): Good morning. My name is Frank Keenan from the Mountain East Conference and I'm a member of the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee speaking on behalf of all Division II student-athletes. Division II SAAC supports proposal 2014-12 for the following reasons: Exempting up to two contests each year for a part of a conference challenge event will provide additional opportunities for possible student-athletes to compete against teams from their own region. SAAC understands the importance of participating in in-region competition when it comes to determining a field for the tournament and we believe that this proposal would ease some of the burden the institutions currently face when trying to schedule this type of competition. We discussed this proposal at length and came to a conclusion that exempting up to two games every year as opposed to two games once every three years under the current legislation would not negatively impact the student-athlete's Life in the Balance. In particular, playing the additional games will not result in a significant amount of time missed in the classroom, studying or away from campus. Further, basketball student-athletes would be able to appropriately adjust to any missed time, to maintain focus on academics and any other interests away from basketball. For these reasons we encourage you to support this proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. 1.

DELEGATE WILL PREWITT (*Great American Conference*): Good morning, I'm Will Prewitt, Commissioner of the Great American Conference. 2014-12 is a de facto increase in the game limit that flies in the face of our recently passed Life in the Balance legislation. From a competitive standpoint this proposal negatively impacts conferences and institutions that are geographic outliers within their region. For these reasons I encourage a no vote on 2014-12.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Is there any further discussion? It is now time to decide Proposal No. 2014-12. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no," or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any vote still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-12 passes. We move to Proposal No. 13. Proposal No. 13 is a roll call vote with an effective date of June 1, 2014. There will be two votes on the proposal. The June 1, 2014, effective date will be considered first by paddle vote and it will need two-thirds approval to pass. After the effective date vote we will then have discussion on the proposal followed by a roll call vote on the merits of Proposal No. 13. This is a membership-sponsored proposal sponsored by the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the Mid-American Intercollegiate Athletic Association. In addition this proposal is a football only vote so only those institutions and conferences that sponsor football will be allowed to cast a vote. However, any delegate with speaking rights may speak to the proposal on the convention floor. Do I have a motion? Microphone No. 4.

DELEGATE BILL ROBINSON (*Great Lakes Intercollegiate Conference*): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Bill Robinson, Commissioner of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Conference and member of the Division II Football Committee. On behalf of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletics Conference and my colleagues at the Mid-American Intercollegiate Athletic Association, I move the Proposal No. 2013-14.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there a second? We have a second.

DELEGATE BILL ROBINSON (*Great Lakes Intercollegiate Conference*): Mr. Chairman, I move the effective date on behalf of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the Mid-American Intercollegiate Athletic Association the effective date for the proposal 2014-13 which is June 1, 2014.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second. Discussion on the effective date? Any discussion on the effective date?

DELEGATE BILL ROBINSON (*Great Lakes Intercollegiate Conference*): Mr. Chairman, the June 1, 2014, effective date will allow strength and conditioning coaches to design and conduct work-outs with student-athletes in June, this particular summer, in comparison to most of our proposals which are passed August 1st, that will put us ahead of that in allowing that effective date to be utilized this summer, so that's why it was moved up to June 1st.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you, any further discussion on the effective date? It is now time -- yes, football only. It is now time for our paddle vote on June 1, 2014, effective date for Proposal No. 13. All in favor, football, please raise your paddles, thank you; all opposed, football only, please raise your paddles, thank you; abstentions? Thank you. The effective date passes.

DELEGATE BILL ROBINSON (*Great Lakes Intercollegiate Conference*): Mr. Chairman, I speak to some of the merits of the proposal. The No. 1 issue that we have in this proposal is safety. A student-athlete can participate in conditioning under our program under a supervised professional. There's no better situation for student-athlete wellness. The question of voluntary will always be on the table. June 1st or any time in or around June 1st you will find any student-athlete participating in his own work-outs. There is no better situation to provide him the position of strength and conditioning coaches helping him. Student-athletes want to play, they want to be in the best situations to compete and this will also provide a situation where they will be trained effectively and avoid injury. It will only work to enhance their overall situations. The uniqueness of football provides a situation, the numbers and the volume of that sport. With the numbers and the volume of that sport, it increases the possibility for injury and other illnesses to happen during the summer months. This preparation will only help with that. Also the sport provides a situation of trauma. It is a violent sport and with that the better conditioning that you have for those student-athletes, it only provides for their better overall wellness. The Committee on Competitive Safeguards supports this proposal. It also raises awareness for the strength and conditioning coach and their profile. This person has to be certified to participate with the student-athletes. It also provides our institutions with diligence that they have their emergency medical plans and action plans in place. For these reasons I promote our membership to promote support of 2014-13.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Microphone No. 3.

DELEGATE JERRY HUGHES (*University of Central Missouri*): Jerry Hughes, Director of Athletics, University of Central Missouri and a member of the MIAA and co-sponsor of this proposal. Football is important to us in the MIAA and I'd like to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate Northwest Missouri State, a member of our conference, who is the current national champion. We maintain Life in the Balance in all of our sports. We are of the belief that this proposal will allow us to do that. It is important to note that what this legislation allows and what it does not allow. The legislation does not allow coaches to require student-athletes to remain on campus during the summer for practices or required work-outs. The legislation does not allow coaches to conduct summer-related work-outs included in the reign of football specific drills or plays with their football team outside of what is currently permissible in the non-championship season. What it does permit is strength coaches who previously have been allowed to only monitor summer work-outs to actually prescribe them and offer appropriate expertise when the advice and instruction is sought. On most of our campuses our weight rooms are open all summer and strength coaches supervise these facilities. It only makes sense that we allow our strength coaches to be able to do their jobs and assist student-athletes to reach their fullest development by providing both supervision and instruction. We do not consider this legislation to be controversial but rather overdue in its passage and application. We urge the football playing schools to support this proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Microphone 7.

DELEGATE JEFF GALL (*Truman State University*): Jeff Gall, faculty representative, Truman

State University, Great Lakes Valley Conference. We are a football playing school. We clearly support safety measures for all student-athletes but rise in opposition simply because this seems to be legislating inequity. Without this legislation if we attempted to put forth this policy on our campus alone it would clearly be a violation. It seems that attempts have been made to pass this legislation in the past for all sports and those attempts have failed. It would appear that approaching it this way for football only might be an attempt to down the road once it passes to encourage other sports to come forward and say, Well, if football can have this privilege so should all sports. So it seems to me that for our institution to make this a policy that would benefit the athletes in only one sport would be indeed legislating inequity and perhaps even a back-door attempt to encourage the Association down the road to pursue legislation that has failed in the past, so we oppose this legislation.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 5.

DELEGATE ROGER THOMAS (*University of Mary*): My name is Roger Thomas. I'm the athletic director at the University of Mary in the Northern Sun Conference, former member of Management Council. And probably the reason I stand to speak here is I was a Division II football coach for 20 plus years and still am involved with lots of the football coaches at many of your schools. I would stand to support this for some practical reasons. As you know, probably on your campus, or you don't know, there will be football players at many campuses lifting, working out in your weight rooms this summer. And the strength coaches that have been with the role of observing and monitoring is what they have done now, and I believe this legislation for safety factors and a bunch of other things. I think one thing to remember is football players in their preparation for a fall season, summer is a critical time. You know, the athletes on your campus that play sports throughout the year, they have that strength coach with them on campus during the year and they naturally then can do the conditioning things in those months while school is going on. A football player or a fall sport athlete does not have that advantage. I think this is critical. It's going on already. I just think we need to get past the point of monitoring for safety and for a bunch of other reasons and in terms of the idea of the other sports, if you are a fall sport and you're training for that and you're male or female that is a critical timing for you, critical piece of timing by using the summer work-out programs, and it's voluntary. But I will say again, in all my years of coaching we had lots of football players who decided to stay around town on campus to lift or they got a job, maybe they hung onto their housing so they didn't have to go find a new place to live next fall, but they are there and I think this legislation allows us to work with them properly and prepare them safely for the football season. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone 4.

DELEGATE DREW BOGNER (*Molloy College*): I'm Drew Bogner, president of Molloy College and I understand -- we don't have a football program at Molloy and I understand what's seen as a necessity among football schools to be able to provide safety and strength and conditioning and we've had that conversation before, so I'm not here to argue and encourage the football schools to vote against this legislation. I think that's probably not realistic, but I want to go back to the conversation about process. I think this -- I know we're not going to deal with that today but I certainly would encourage us to look at the process that allows us to deal with legislation as a one-sport entity. That does not seem to be in keeping with our philosophy in Division II, and I think of the slippery slope that that could be where we'll have legislation to talk about ice hockey and it's only the ice hockey schools that will have that conversation, or want to talk about softball and it's only the softball schools who have that conversation, so I don't like the process that's led us to this. I would think we should be able to stand on the merits of legislation and if it's good for our student-athletes it's good for our student-athletes and it should be compelling and we should approve it from that perspective. And this could well be compelling but I think the process is a dangerous process and I would ask that we find a way to deal with this process in the future. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 2.

DELEGATE MARCUS CLARKE (*Shaw University*): Marcus Clarke, Director of Athletics, Shaw University. I stand in opposition to 2014-13. This legislation resurfaces every year in an attempt to allow certain sports to have structured work-outs conducted by strength and conditioning personnel. I've gathered perspective from several of my colleagues, and while I will admit that compliance monitoring of our current legislation which allows for strength and conditioning monitoring activities only may be challenging, I believe this legislation will place undue pressure on student-athletes to stay in their campus and participate in voluntarily mandated summer work-outs. Additionally, has any thought been given to who is financially responsible for any injuries incurred during the voluntarily conducted sessions by institution's strength coaches? Shaw University did not carry athletic insurance and would be financially challenged to do so. For this reason I ask you to oppose this legislation. This will not support Life in the Balance but Life in the Fast Lane. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 3.

DELEGATE JONATHAN DARBY (*Great American Conference*): Good morning. My name is Jonathan Darby from the Great American Conference and I'm a member of the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee speaking on behalf of all Division II student-athletes. The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 2014-13 for the following reasons: This proposal will permit strength and conditioning personnel to design, conduct work-out programs for football student-athletes beginning June 1st through the conclusion of the institution's summer vacation period provided such work-outs are voluntary, conducted at the request of the student-athlete. As a former football student-athlete I recognize the importance of a properly designed and constructed strength and conditioning program. This proposal ultimately promotes student-athlete well-being by allowing conditioning to occur in a safe and controlled environment and permitting strength and conditioning personnel to design and conduct the work-outs. This proposal also maintains Life in the Balance because football student-athletes will not be allowed to participate in these activities with coaching staff members who are not strength and conditioning coaches. We encourage you to support this proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 9.

DELEGATE DAVID RIGGINS (*Mars Hill University*): Yes, I'm David Riggins, Director of Athletics at the Mars Hill University. I stood at a microphone at a business session in 2012 and made a point and immediately was labeled as paranoia. In working on that, made some progress until this piece of legislation showed up and the demons are back. We can talk about this piece of legislation like others being permissive. I think we all know that's a ridiculous concept. It's no more permissive than not recruiting. Recruiting isn't permissive. This is not permissive. One thing that all of us have learned over a number of years is you cannot include the terms voluntary and work-out in the same piece of legislation. Here we have it in the same sentence. I came to convention opposing this piece of legislation. Since I've been here seems like every meeting I've gone to something has screamed out don't do it. For instance, if you were at the business session or the educational session where we looked at data from student-athletes' surveys some things jumped off the page at me that should jump at all of us. One is that 39 percent of our male student-athletes experience some level of distrust of our coaches at some point. We need to start measuring legislation and decisions based upon how that's going to be viewed by student-athletes and who's paying the biggest price for it and who's getting the biggest benefit. I think this is problematic. It struck me that 21 percent of our male student-athletes felt that they feel isolated at times on their own campuses based primarily upon the fact that we have very mobile student bodies who have cars and vacate our campus on weekends. Now we're talking about two months of the summer where every day is a weekend based on student enrollment and activities on that campus. I think then I go to the business session and President Emmert and President O'Brien have a very insightful conversation about how do we allow more opportunities for student-athletes in Division II to study abroad and do internships. Now we're talking about a piece of legislation that will eliminate those opportunities for student-athletes. And I know we can say they could go study abroad and not work out during the summer. No, they cannot because the work-outs are only for those people that are contributors to their team or people who want to be contributors to their team. That is

every student-athlete on every team at every institution. Everyone wants to fall into those two categories, and taking the summer off from your football work-outs in order to do an internship or study abroad does not put you in a position where you're a contributor. Last but not least, the best reason to defeat this legislation is we're voting on a far-reaching intrusive piece of legislation that has absolutely zero regulations except for the dates, who conducts it, may be at the end of that list, but the things that we pair with work-outs, countable hours do not apply here because this is a voluntary activity, voluntary, and it's during the vacation period. So the question is how many days a week can they work out during the summer? The answer is every day. How many hours a day can they work out? The answer is someone else will make that decision, but it can be any number of this that we want to have. We wouldn't allow another piece of legislation -- I don't think I've ever seen another piece of legislation come down the pike that had no regulations, no protections for student-athletes in terms of overzealous coaches or administrators or whoever else might be handling these programs. We put limitations, countable hours limitations, days off, all those type of things with legislation. I can't imagine that we would pass this legislation and open the door to just whatever comes comes, so I would ask you to join the ranks of the paranoid and to help defeat this legislation. Help us stay with Life in the Balance, not take that great leap toward life out of balance. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, I call the question. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 2014-13. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-13 passes. Now it's time to move to Proposal No. 14. Proposal No. 14 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2014. Microphone 8.

DELEGATE JAVIER CEVALLOS (*Kutztown University*): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Javier Cevallos, Kutztown University, Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move proposal 2014-14.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: I have a motion. Do I have a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE JAVIER CEVALLOS (*Kutztown University*): The NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics manages emerging sports for women program, which is designed to explore participation and sponsorship interests for non-championship sports for women that might develop into championship sports. Of the nine sports in the regional list, four -- water polo, rowing, bowling and ice hockey -- grew to championship sports. The emerging sports program also helps schools provide more athletics opportunities for women. To move a sport from emerging sports list to an NCAA championship sport there must be a minimum of 40 sponsoring institutions; and the membership must seek legislative changes and funding for championship, through the normal legislative and budget process. Adopting this proposal, which has been considered by all three Divisions, will establish triathlon as an emerging sport for women and put in place the amateurism, eligibility, financial aid, playing and practice seasons and sport sponsorship requirements for the sport. It is important to note that adoption of this proposal does not require institutions to sponsor women's triathlon at the varsity level, as institutions have the discretion to determine if women's triathlon is a viable option for its athletics program. This proposal simply establishes the regulation for the sport and provides additional competitive opportunities for female students. So please join me in support of 2014-14.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 3.

DELEGATE CARMEN LEEDS (*Emporia State University*): Carmen Leeds, Emporia State University, member of the Committee on Women's Athletics. On behalf of the Committee on Women's Athletics, I'm asking for support of Proposal 2014. This is a vote to give women an opportunity to participate in triathlon as an emerging sport in the NCAA. This is not a vote about whether your institution will sponsor triathlon. We ask

you to vote yes even if you don't intend to add the sport on your campus so that others in the Division for whom it does make sense with regards to student interests, budget and athletic mission have the opportunity to add the sport. We want to clarify for the membership that the emerging sport list is a try-out system for opportunities for women. Some sports grow and some do not. We are responding to female student-athlete interest with sports that make sense as a potential NCAA championship sport. Please note that Division 1 has already passed this legislation and most emerging sports have a better chance to grow when available in all divisions. Once again this is a vote to give women opportunity to participate. This is not a vote about whether your institution will sponsor triathlon. Please vote yes in support of Proposal 2014-14.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Any further discussion? Hearing none, we'll call the question. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 2014-14. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes now being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-14 passes. We move to Proposal No. 2014-15. Proposal No. 2014-15 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2018, for student-athletes initially enrolling in a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2018. Microphone No. 7.

DELEGATE DEBBIE FORD (*University of Wisconsin-Parkside*): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Debbie Ford, the Chancellor from the University of Wisconsin-Parkside and member of the Great Lakes Valley Conference and member of the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move proposal 2014-15.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE DEBBIE FORD (*University of Wisconsin-Parkside*): Proposal No. 2014-15 is the first of five proposals in the Path to Graduation package resulting from a comprehensive review of academic requirements. The two-year review by the Division II Academic Requirements Task Force has focused on Division II Academic Performance Census data and feedback from the Division II membership. The Division has now collected sufficient data to make informed decisions regarding academic requirements. One of the main strategies of the Division's strategic plan is to analyze and assess research so as to establish requirements that impact and advance the academic success of our student-athletes. Therefore, we need to make sure we use this data, that we now have available, to modify our standards to guide our student-athletes toward the ultimate goal of college graduation. This is especially pertinent due to the recently announced drop in Division II's Academic Success Rate. The proposals in this package focus on the academic readiness of prospective student-athletes, the success of student-athletes once enrolled at a collegiate institution, the opportunity for access to athletically-related financial aid, practice and competition and administrative efficiency. Current initial eligibility legislation includes a cut score of a combined 820 on the SAT or a minimum sum score of 68 on the ACT to be a full qualifier. The proposed standard will adjust the GPA and test requirements to sliding scales that will increase access for student-athletes who are more likely to succeed academically than some student-athletes who are qualifiers under the current standard. The majority of these student-athletes are from under-represented groups. In addition to being a fairer standard, the Academic Performance Census data shows that student-athletes who meet the proposed initial eligibility standards are more likely to graduate within six years of enrollment. The proposal maintains Division II's unique partial-qualifier status which provides access to practice and financial aid for student-athletes who are more at risk of academic underperformance. The August 1, 2018, effective date provides ample opportunity for the education of high school students. The majority of prospective student-athletes that will be impacted by the new standard in August of 2018 will begin high school fall in 2014. So please join me and the members of the Presidents Council in support of Proposal No. 2014-15.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Further discussion? Microphone No. 7.

DELEGATE DEDE ALLEN (*University of Alaska-Anchorage*): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am DeDe Allen. I am the Associate Director of Athletics at the University of Alaska-Anchorage. I rise in opposition to this particular proposal. I believe that the small number of student-athletes that this might affect, I don't believe that there's actually anecdotal evidence to provide the basis for this. Those partial qualifiers may have actually succeeded because they had to sit at your own precedence, so I ask you to consider that when you vote on this proposal.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 4.

DELEGATE DREW BOGNER (*Molloy College*): Drew Bogner, president of Molloy College. I served on the Academics Requirements Task Force and I'd like to just real briefly share a Presidential perspective on 2014-15, and the rest of the legislative package. At our college and universities we are under increasing scrutiny and pressure to have an effective and realistic Path to Graduation for all of our students including and perhaps in particular our student-athletes. I encourage all the delegates who support the Path to Graduation legislative package whether public or private institutions we are being held accountable for our graduation rates. If you take a look at the federal scorecard you can see that that is one of the four criteria that's up there right now. We must understand in Division II that helping our students remain eligible is not our main priority. Our No. 1 priority is making sure that our students graduate from our institutions. The pathway to graduation legislative package is based on research, real research, that indicates the factors that lead our students along this pathway to graduation. So I urge you to vote yes on 2014-15 and the other legislative proposals that are in this package. We owe it to our students to make sure that each and every one of our student-athletes graduate from our institution, not just make sure that they can play the next season. So thank you for your support on these legislative proposals.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 6.

DELEGATE B.J. POMROY (*Shepherd University*): B.J. Pomroy, Director of Athletics at Shepherd University. I rise in opposition of this proposal. I'm speaking of a history of working with institutions that range from highly selective to open admission and from a state that has state requirements for a college scholarship and when the GPA was raised in that state and the test score was not, there were more individuals in the state gaining that special scholarship program even though the GPA requirement had been raised leading me to see great inflation be the end result in students not being any better prepared for their four-year college experience. Additionally, I state in listing of the statistical information that the notice states the data included SAT scores and does not mention ACT scores. I find it remarkable that as we are looking to increase academic standards once a student reaches our campus but we're diminishing the standards they must meet to attend our campus. On some of those scores, sum set of scores of ACT have a 9, 9, 9 and a 10 and has a 3.3 GPA can be a qualifier. I don't believe someone who only gets double digits in one subset is prepared for the academic rigor as a student-athlete with qualifier status. The partial qualifier status still would be an option for someone who is in that category. It would allow them to get their feet wet in college and have that experience, but I don't think, again, someone who can get to that point of only having one score of a subset on the ACT of double digits is prepared to be a qualifier.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 3.

DELEGATE BRYNN SEIDENSTRICKER (*Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference*): Morning, my name is Brynn Seidenstricker from the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference and I'm a member of the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee speaking on behalf all Division II student-athletes. The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 2014-15 for the following reasons: The proposed initial eligibility index places student-athletes more firmly on the Path to Graduation and demonstrates the Division's commitment to the academic success of the student-athletes. In particular, this proposal improves the chance of academic success

for student-athletes and provides greater access to college athletics. First, prospective student-athletes who are unable to meet the sliding scale for qualifier access will still have the opportunity to practice and receive aid by meeting partial qualifier status under the second less vigorous sliding scale. Second, the proposal would grant full qualifier status to a group of student-athletes who are currently partial qualifiers and this group of student-athletes is more likely to contain student-athletes from under-represented groups. Finally, the August 1, 2018, effective date would allow plenty of time for high school students to be educated on and adjust to the new standards as this proposal would begin to apply to individuals who begin their freshman year of high school in the fall of 2014. We all know that when the bar is raised student-athletes will also rise to the new requirements. We unanimously support this part of the Path to Graduation package and encourage you to support the proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone 6.

DELEGATE JIM NAUMOVICH (*Great Lakes Valley Conference*): Morning, Jim Naumovich, Commissioner Great Lakes Valley Conference. On behalf of the Management Council, I also want to speak in support of proposal 2014-15. Some of the membership have raised concerns regarding the test scores that must be earned by a prospective student-athlete based on his or her grade point average. Although the proposed sliding scales model includes test score and GPA combinations for qualifier status with test scores lower than the currently required 820 SAT and 68 ACT score, the required minimum GPA for qualifier status is increased to a 2.200. Data has shown that high school GPA is a much greater predictor of academic success than test scores. The Division II Academic Performance Census data has also shown that very few prospective student-athletes present an academic profile that includes very high GPA and a very low test score. As a result, concerns about abuse of the proposed sliding scales are unfounded. The sliding scales were specifically developed based on data that indicated which prospective student-athletes are more likely to achieve academic success at Division II institutions. While data gives us a lot of information on the performance of first-year student-athletes, it is very difficult to predict how initial eligibility standards will affect graduation rates in the future. As such, we cannot ascertain a specific increase in graduation rates based on the proposed changes; however, we can confirm that these changes are a more fair standard and provide increased access to student-athletes. The proposed sliding scales will be made available in charts and figures that coaches and administrators can easily reference when determining what GPA or test score a prospective student-athlete will need to achieve qualifier or partial qualifier status. If a prospective student-athlete is unable to satisfy the proposed sliding scale requirements, institutions will still have the opportunity to pursue an initial eligibility waiver in which individual circumstances of that student-athlete will be considered. This proposal creates a fairer standard that was developed through a data driven review and is designed to ensure that incoming student-athletes are positioned for academic success upon arrival at our Division II institutions. For these reasons and those previously stated, please join me in support of proposal 2014-15.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Thank you. Any further discussion? Microphone No. 5.

DELEGATE NATE SALANT (*Gulf South Conference*): Nate Salant, Commissioner of the Gulf South Conference. I have a question I think I should know the answer to but I don't. I've asked some of our different resource people and they haven't told me. If a person only puts their name on the answer sheet and does not answer a single question correctly or single question at all, what is the score they receive in the SAT or the ACT? Could someone help me with that?

MS. TERRI GRONAU: Terri Steeb Gronau, Vice President for Division II. Nate, since we don't oversee ACT or SAT, we're unable to answer that question.

DELEGATE NATE SALANT (*Gulf South Conference*): The only reason I asked the question was

if we are saying that a person can receive no points and is scoring for just putting their name on the paper, it gets me a little uncomfortable, but I don't know the answer so I just wanted to ask.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Other discussion? Hearing no other discussion I call the question. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 2014-15. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-15 passes. We now move to Proposal No. 16. Proposal No. 16 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2016, for certifications of progress towards degree for fall 2016 and thereafter. Microphone No. 1.

DELEGATE BRENDA CATES (*University of Mount Olive*): Thank you, Brenda Cates, Faculty Athletics Representative, University of Mount Olive, member of Conference Carolinas and member of the Division II Management Council. On behalf of the Management Council and the Academic Requirements Task Force, I move Proposal No. 2014-16.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE BRENDA CATES (*University of Mount Olive*) Proposal No. 2014-16 is the first of three progress-towards-degree proposals in the Path to Graduation package. It represents a shift in philosophy for Division II. Current legislation is focused on certifying student-athletes to maintain eligibility, while the proposed standards are focused on placing student-athletes more firmly on a path to graduation. While considering this academic package, it is important to note the proposals support and ensure the academic success of student-athletes, which is consistent with the Division's philosophy statement and strategic positioning platform. The proposed changes in Proposal No. 2014-16 include areas in the progress-towards-degree legislation where there was a great deal of consensus based on feedback from the membership. Those areas include good academic standing, term-by-term credit hour requirements, credits earned during the academic year and grade point average requirements. The proposal does not change good academic standing regulations. The current legislation is simply being restructured to emphasize the requirements based on feedback that the good academic standing legislation was being widely misapplied. Next, the proposal would increase the six-hour rule to require the completion of 9-semester or 8-quarter hours during a student-athlete's previous term of full-time enrollment. Based on Division II Academic Performance Census data, this change is consistent with term-by-term credit-earning behavior of academically successful student-athletes. Proposal No. 2014-16 also raises the grade point average requirements for student-athletes. Requiring a 2.0 GPA of student-athletes each academic year regardless of the number of credits completed reflects membership feedback gathered at the 2013 Convention and in membership feedback surveys. Many institutions indicated that institutional good academic standing requirements already require a student-athlete to maintain a 2.0 grade point average. The proposed 18-semester or 27-quarter hour requirement is designed to ensure that student-athletes are dedicating time to academics during the regular academic year. It is also easier to administer than the current 75/25 rule and eliminates concerns about student-athletes loading up on summer course work to maintain eligibility. The August 1, 2016, effective date provides notice to initial and currently enrolled student-athletes as to the increased academic requirements. If adopted, student-athletes should be advised to begin taking coursework in alignment with the proposed changes during the 2015-16 academic year, since progress-toward-degree certifications under the new requirements would begin in fall 2016. The proposed requirements achieve the goal of placing student-athletes on a firmer path to graduation without significantly increasing administrative burden. The academic success of student-athletes is paramount and Division II is committed to assisting student-athletes in their pursuit of a degree and success beyond intercollegiate athletics. Please join me in support of Proposal No. 2014-16. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Further discussion? Hearing none, I call the question. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 2014-16. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls

will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-16 passes. We move to Proposal No. 17. Proposal No. 17 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2016, for certifications of Progress Towards Degree for fall 2016 and thereafter. Do I have a motion? Microphone No. 12.

DELEGATE KEITH VITENSE (*Cameron University*): Thank you, President O'Brien. My name is Keith Vitense. I serve as the Faculty Athletics Representative at Cameron University, a member Lone Star Conference and I've also had the honor of serving as Chair of the Academic Requirements Committee during the development of these legislative proposals. On behalf of the Academic Requirements Task Force and Academic Requirements Committee, I move proposal 2014-17.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second.

MR. VITENSE: DELEGATE KEITH VITENSE (*Cameron University*): Thank you. Proposal No. 2014-17 is the second of a three progress-towards-degree proposals in the Path to Graduation package. The proposed change would increase the annual credit hour requirements to 27-semester or 40-quarter hours during the first two years of enrollment. Annual credit hour requirements after a student-athlete is required to designate a degree would remain at 24-semester or 36-quarter hours. The proposed changes also modifies the averaging method currently used in some cases for certification of eligibility. Requiring a student-athlete to complete 27-semester or 40-quarter hours during his or her first two years of collegiate enrollment is consistent with credit-earning behavior of academically successful student-athletes. In fact, our data shows that 97 percent of student-athletes who earn 54 to 59.9 credits during years one and two combined are known or likely graduates. Again, it is critical that we consider the recent drop in the Division II Academic Success Rate and act now to take steps to ensure greater success for our Division II student-athletes in the future. At the initial meetings of the task force several members proposed a four-year graduation model, which would require student-athletes to earn a minimum of 30 credit hours per year; however, based on membership feedback, a compromise was made to require 27-semester hours or 40-quarter hours per academic year during the first two years of collegiate enrollment. It is important to note that a student-athlete who earns the minimum number of annual credit hours required by Proposal No. 2014-17 will still be well short of graduating in four years at most institutions, and may not have earned enough credits to graduate in five years at some institutions. Per the proposal, the annual credit hour requirement after the first two years of collegiate enrollment would drop back down to 24-semester or 48-quarter hours, which helps to reduce issues related to class availability in a particular major or course of study. The proposal would also eliminate the averaging method following the required designation of the degree, which ensures a student-athlete is making progress towards that degree each academic year rather than relying on past performance in courses taken prior to the required designation of a degree including high school Advanced Placement courses. The August 1, 2016, effective date provides notice to initial and currently enrolled student-athletes as to the increased academic requirements. If adopted, student-athletes should be advised to begin taking coursework in alignment with the proposed changes during the 2015-16 academic year, since progress-towards-degree certifications under the new requirements would begin in fall 2016. I ask you to please join me in support of Proposal No. 2014-17.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 7.

DELEGATE DEDE ALLEN (*University of Alaska-Anchorage*): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. DeDe Allen, Associate Director of Athletics at the University of Alaska-Anchorage. I rise in opposition to this not because I don't believe in progress-towards-degree. I do. I also have great faith in the NCAA research staff. My concern is that while the research might show earning 54 credits or more those students may be more likely to graduate, I'm not sure that there's actually a causal relationship but perhaps a correlation. My other concern is that it's very likely that you can have a student-athlete with 26 solid degree credits in their freshman or sophomore year with a 4.0 and they will be ineligible to compete. Our student-athletes on our campus like the safety

net of averaging.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 3.

DELEGATE SPENCER DODD (*Great Northwest Athletic Conference*): My name is Spencer Dodd from the Great Northwest Athletic Conference and I am a member of the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee speaking on behalf of all Division II student-athletes. The Division II SAAC spent a lot of time discussing this proposal at its in-person meeting in November and ultimately agreed to oppose the increase in the annual semester or quarter hour requirement during the first two years of collegiate enrollment under Proposal No. 2014-17. A 27-semester or 40-quarter hour minimum requirement for the first two years of enrollment places too heavy of an academic burden on student-athletes during the transition from high school to college. In addition, the 27-semester or 40-quarter hour requirement could also raise financial concerns for student-athletes who may have to finance tuition for the completion of additional academic work -- and to reach the requirement. Likewise, limited availability of classes could create problems for student-athletes in meeting the proposed 27-semester or 40-quarter hour requirement. Finally, the 27-semester or 40-quarter hour requirement could potentially eliminate a safety net for student-athletes who encounter academic difficulties during the first two years of enrollment. Please note that SAAC did not oppose the changes to the averaging method in this proposal. We encourage you to oppose this proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone 8.

DELEGATE PAUL LEIDIG (*Grand Valley State University*): Well, Paul Leidig, representative from Grand Valley State University and the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I also had the privilege of serving as Chair of the Academics Requirements Committee when we began looking at enormous amounts of the data 106 used to create this package. So I rise on behalf of the Academic Requirements Task Force in support of proposal 2014-17. Requiring student-athletes to earn 27-semester or 40-quarter hours in the first two years of enrollment is supported by data indicating that student-athletes who earn 27 to 29 credits during their first year have eligibility rates after the second year that are 8 percentage points higher than those who earn 24 to 26 and are not significantly different from those who earn 30 or more. The first two years of collegiate enrollment are pivotal in placing a student-athlete firmly on that path to graduation. Roughly 75 percent of our student-athletes currently already earn 27-semester hours in their academic year. And as has previously been mentioned, when we raise the bar on eligibility requirements the vast majority of student-athletes rise to meet that bar. For those that are unable to meet those new requirements, institutions already have the opportunity to pursue a progress-towards-degree waiver based on that unique situation. During the course of the Path to Graduation review, it also became clear that many in the membership have been applying legislation regarding averaging incorrectly for years. The current averaging method is broken. It needs to be fixed to ensure academic success of the student-athlete as well as competitive equity. Although the current averaging method would be eliminated, the proposal maintains the cumulative credit hour option to provide flexibility in the first two years of collegiate enrollment. It permits a student-athlete to earn a cumulative total of 54-semester or 80-quarter hours during the first two years of collegiate enrollment to maintain eligibility in that third year of collegiate enrollment. Please join me in support of proposal 2014-17 and vote yes.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 2.

DELEGATE ED HAMMOND (*Fort Hays State University*): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ed Hammond, President, Fort Hays State University. I rise in opposition to 2014-17. You've heard about the data but I believe the data is flawed. While the data creates a pool of students who had 26.5 or higher grade point -- hours taken and they did graduate at a high rate, there was no attempt by the NCAA research team to control for GPA, to control for support or other factors that could have influenced or created the kind of behavior that they are

trying to measure for. So to make the assumption that because that special group without controls would represent all of our student-athletes is what flaws that assumption and that conclusion. Secondly, I believe this piece of legislation attacks the basic core of Division II and what we stand for, and that's our student-athletes who the vast majority of them, the vast majority of our student-athletes, work their way through school. And what this is going to force us to do or force them to do is go to school in the summer denying them the opportunity to raise the resources that they need to pay for their education. Right now one of the major things we're facing in higher education is increasing student debt. If this passes I predict we will see increased student debt for our student-athletes, not increased graduation rates. I would hope we would join with our student leaders and vote this down.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 6.

DELEGATE HEATHER WILSON (*South Dakota School of the Mines*): Thank you, I'm Heather Wilson. I'm President of the South Dakota School of Mines in Rapid City, South Dakota. We have only engineering and science degrees at the School of Mines. Our high school GPA coming in is average is 3.52 and the 88th percentile in math. Most engineering degrees and most engineering students, athletes and non-athletes, are encouraged to take five years including one co-op experience in order to get their degrees. All of our -- we don't teach remedial math. All of our students, even those coming from high schools that don't teach calculus or pre-calculus have to take Calculus I, II, III, Chemistry, Chemistry II, Physics, these are difficult courses and we do not advise them to take a heavy load. What this proposal will do is treat all of our schools as if they are the same. It lacks the kind of special focus, the student focus, which I think our students deserve from us. I think we need a student focus and student-centered approach that takes into account the difference in degrees and the NCAA research doesn't seem to do that. There are no nonscience and nonengineering degrees at Mines and this means that we will be treating our 4.0 GPA non-athletes differently than from athletes and putting a greater burden on our athletes. That's unfair and also doesn't help us reach higher graduation rates. So I would urge all of you to stand with the students on this one. They are right. This proposal should be defeated.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 7.

DELEGATE EDUARDO OCHOA (*California State University*): I'm Eduardo Ochoa and I'm President of the California State University at Monterey Bay, also former Assistant Secretary for post-secondary education and that experience certainly sensitized me to the importance for our nation to increase graduation rates, increase number of graduates, increase the educational level of our population. So I empathize with NCAA Division II's responsiveness to this national priority; however, higher completion rates should not come at the expense of broad access to higher education. As stated by our leader, Division II has a high percentage of first-year students and those students -- many of them come from socioeconomically disadvantaged households. Research shows that socioeconomic background is the greatest predictor of graduation rates. When we try to develop regulations in the Department of Education to improve the performance of schools that receive financial aid we had to recognize that looking at the socioeconomic background all the student body in an institution had to be factored in when looking at graduation rates. You couldn't apply a single standard to all types of institutions. The data that the NCAA is using to justify this particular proposal in terms of the 27-unit load being associated with higher graduation rates, as several other speakers have commented, does make the assumption that correlation implies causation which is not warranted given that there are many other factors that go into self selecting the group of students that take the higher load. So the proposal also exceeds the federal definition of full-time student and could have the unintended consequence of restricting access to higher education for disadvantaged youth and lowering graduate rates of students whose academic preparation and demands would be better served by a lower unit load, particularly in the first year when students are making the transition from high school to college.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 8.

DELEGATE KATHY HEITZMAN (*Bloomsburg University*): Kathy Heitzman from Bloomsburg University. First and foremost, we have an obligation to assist our student-athletes in the pursuit of a degree. For some of our student-athletes the annual eligibility requirement of 24 credits is a ceiling instead of a floor. Raising the annual requirement to 27 in the first two years will necessarily require a student-athlete to progress towards a degree in a more deliberate fashion. This is even more important given the current economic realities. Most institutions cannot afford to scholarship former student-athletes in their fifth year so that student-athletes can complete their degree. Thus it only makes sense for us to align, as much as is reasonable, degree progression with seasons of eligibility. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 10.

DELEGATE TOM PASKUS (*NCAA Research staff*): Morning, Tom Paskus from the NCAA research staff. I've been asked to come up here and just clarify a couple data issues. First off, a lot of good points made. We have never stated in the analysis of this data that these are necessarily causally linked very well, that these are correlational data and there are certainly some aspects of what will transpire if the standard moves to 27 that we can't anticipate from these. We have done significant modeling around credits and how they increase prediction of eligibility and graduation controlling for high school variables and the GPA of the student. Somebody had mentioned that that hasn't been done. We have done that. Does show the credits as a strong predictor. I think one of the strongest predictors that we need to note is exhausted eligibility. If the student-athlete exhausts their athletic eligibility and is not close to earning their degree, those students are at an extremely high risk of never graduating. And we're happy to take any additional questions.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 2.

DELEGATE EARL EDWARDS (*U.C. San Diego*): Earl Edwards, Athletic Director, U.C. San Diego, responsible for the weather for the last three days here.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you very much.

DELEGATE EARL EDWARDS (*U.C. San Diego*): I speak against Proposal 17 for primarily two reasons. I know we've heard a lot of those already but I spent a lot of time putting this together so I felt compelled to address those two reasons. The first is that I'm concerned about the negative impact on the vast majority of our student-athletes who are already performing well in the classroom. Our student-athletes already have a demanding and challenging schedule. They spend many hours competing athletically, many hours in the classroom, many hours working. They also perform community service and other outstanding activities for us as a Division and themselves. Adding an additional academic requirement makes an already demanding lifestyle for these students more demanding. My second concern, and this is not just for this proposal, but it's a concern that I have on a regular basis as we look at NCAA legislation. My concern is that the impact this legislation has on institutional autonomy when it comes to academic issues. We currently have an academy requirement for our institutions -- academic requirements for institutions that works. It keeps academics as a primary focus for all of us. It's not broke. Each institution has the mission and focus on how they want to manage their school academically in terms of majors, access, requirements for graduations. Forcing institutions to add additional academic requirements at this time should be left up to each institution due to the impact that it has on our student-athletes, incredible student-athletes, and the impact that it has in an area that I think is sacred for us when it comes to institution autonomy and that's the academic requirements. For those reasons I urge you to vote against Proposition 17.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 6.

DELEGATE LUOLUO HONG (*University of Hawaii*): My name is Luoluo Hong, I'm Vice

Chancellor for Student Affairs at the University of Hawaii at Hilo. We are a native Hawaiian serving institution and also one of the first of six institutions to be designated as Alaska native, Asian American and Pacific Islander serving, so we also have a high number of students who are low income in addition to having a lot of under-represented minorities. I want to echo what the president from Alliance of States in support of Complete College America. We stand firmly behind efforts and initiatives to advance graduation; however, I do want to make two important points. Data from Complete College America shows that we have a large number of students who are taking a significant number of credit hours that greatly exceed the number required to graduate and are still not attaining a degree. So I think it's important that we do not rush to conclude that taking more credits per semester will lead to on-time graduation. They have to be taking the right credits each semester to be on the pathway to graduation. The second piece that I just want to share is a philosophical one. I do have concerns when we pass legislation that appears to place greater burden on the student to take personal responsibility for their graduation. Now while I do believe students have significant responsibility to do so, I also think we as institutions have to look at our own practices to make sure that we're not creating barriers for students to graduate on time. My concern with this legislation is that it appears to state that it's student-athlete behavior which gets in the way of graduation and not necessarily what we are doing as institutions. So University of Hawaii at Hilo will be voting no on Proposal No. 17.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 3.

DELEGATE JERRY HUGHES (*University of Central Missouri*): Jerry Hughes, Director of Athletics, University of Central Missouri, I call the question.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there a second to call the question? There is a second to call the question. This is a non-debatable motion. We're going to have a paddle vote. It takes two-thirds to call the question which stops debate. At this time all those in favor of call the question, please raise your paddles, thank you; all opposed, please raise your paddles; abstentions? The question is called. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 17. 119 Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-17 is defeated. We move now to Proposal No. 18. Proposal No. 18 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2016, for certification to progress-towards-degree for fall 2016 and thereafter. Microphone 8.

DELEGATE TOM HAAS (*Grand Valley State University*): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Tom Haas, President of Grand Valley State University and member of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. On behalf of Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2014-18.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE TOM HAAS (*Grand Valley State University*): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Proposal No. 2014-18 would maintain the current annual credit hour requirement 24-semester or 36-quarter hours. Similar to Proposal No. 2014-17, this proposal would eliminate the current averaging method, which you've already heard about is being inconsistently and often incorrectly applied. Many of you would be shocked to learn that your institution may have incorrectly certified students under the weighting average method based upon common mistakes and a misunderstanding of the averaging method. For instance, many certifying officers are unaware that the averaging method may only be used for certifications prior to the fall term. In addition, many are unaware that when determining the denominator in the averaging calculation, a student-athlete is responsible for all terms occurring during the academic year in which he or she is enrolled in a term. In some cases, the legislation may require a student-athlete to be held accountable for a term in which he or she wasn't enrolled at all. In addition to addressing issues related to the application of the averaging method, eliminating the averaging method following the required designation of degree ensures student-athletes are making actual progress to-

wards a degree in each academic year. The August 1, 2016, effective date provides initial notice -- provides notice to initial and currently enrolled students as to the increased academic requirements. If adopted, student-athletes should be advised to begin taking coursework in alignment with the proposed changes during the 2015-16 academic year, since the progress-towards-degree certifications under the new requirements will begin in the fall of 2016. Please join me in support of Proposal No. 2014-18. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Is there further discussion? Microphone No. 2.

DELEGATE ED HAMMOND (*Fort Hays State University*): Yes, Mr. Chairman, Ed Hammond, President, Fort Hays State University. I rise in opposition to this. To vote for this simply because the averaging calculation hasn't been done correctly is a condemnation of our educational process within the NCAA. I don't believe that institutions are out there trying to twist and misuse it. If they don't know the correct way to implement it then we need to educate them correctly so that they can implement it. No one has contended that the averaging doesn't work. It's just not being implemented right. Let's correct that and not vote to eliminate it in this particular resolution.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 3.

DELEGATE SAMANTHA WHITTIER: (*Northeastern Conference*): Good morning, my name is Samantha Whittier from the Northeastern Conference and I am a member of the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee speaking on behalf of all Division II student-athletes. Although Division II SAAC did not support Proposal No. 2014-17, the National SAAC supports Proposal No. 2014-18 for the following reasons: This proposal places student-athletes more firmly on the Path to Graduation and demonstrates the Division's commitment to the academic success of the student-athletes eliminating the averaging methods, but allowing student-athletes to earn a cumulative number of credits over two years of enrollment prior to the designation of a degree insures that student-athletes are focused on earning hours towards this designated degree on an annual basis. The delayed effective date of this proposal allows adequate time for student-athletes to be educated on and adjust to the new requirements. We encourage you to support this proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Further discussion?

DELEGATE CARMEN LEEDS (*Emporia State University*): Carmen Leeds, Emporia State. This is Emporia State's view but we are in opposition of this proposal due to the elimination of the averaging method. Over the years we have seen an increase of our student-athletes taking classes toward a minor to better get themselves in a situation to have a better job, and if your institution does not allow minor classes to be counted toward a major then the averaging method is very critical to help those students as they progress to be able to remain eligible. These are the good students. These are not the students who aren't doing well that we need to use the averaging method for. These are the students who are wanting to excel and add additional course work to better position themselves to get a job. Also the student-athletes who are fifth-year athletes who come in and red shirt or gray shirt to better prepare themselves for college also run into the situation of classes not being offered every semester and have to supplement with additional classes that may have a minor component to it as well and the average method is critical in that instance as well. So Emporia State opposes this legislation.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 4.

DELEGATE DENISHA HENDRICKS (*Kentucky State University*): Good morning, Dr. Denisha Hendricks, Director of Athletics at Kentucky State University and member of the Management Council. On behalf of the Management Council and the Academic Requirements Task Force, I want to speak in support of Proposal No. 2014-18. Although the current averaging method would be eliminated as we know it today, the proposal maintains a cumulative credit hour option to provide flexibility in the first two years of collegiate

enrollment. It will permit a student-athlete to earn a cumulative total of 48-semester or 72-quarter hours during the first two years of collegiate enrollment to maintain eligibility in the third year of collegiate enrollment. Because the averaging method is being applied incorrectly and inconsistently, if Proposal No. 2014-18 is not adopted the Academic Requirements Committee will revisit the averaging method and recommend additional changes to the legislation in the future. This proposed change eliminates the current concerns with the averaging method and it will likely result in fewer inadvertent violations and competition by ineligible student-athletes moving forward. Please join me in support of the proposal 2014-18.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 12.

DELEGATE KEITH VITENSE (*Cameron University*): I'm sorry, I had a consultation on the side with one of our statisticians who said something I absolutely didn't understand so I may ask him to step up to the microphone after I'm finished. One of the things I'd like to point out is that there are a couple of problems with averaging that have been pointed out but I think the most significant one is the possibility that students may rely on credit hours that do not apply towards their degree.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Microphone 12, could you identify yourself, please and affiliation.

DELEGATE KEITH VITENSE (*Cameron University*): I'm sorry, Keith Vitense, Cameron University, Lone Star Conference, again, I was confused by staff. I'm blaming it all on Greg. To continue, a student-athlete in their -- after their fourth semester starting their third year of collegiate enrollment under the proposal would be required to earn all credit hours towards their degree. That is no change from what we have now. Right now a student-athlete after their fourth full-time semester is required to declare a degree and all of the hours must go towards that degree. If a student-athlete after their fourth semester is taking hours towards a minor those hours should not be used in calculating the averaging method. Because after the fourth semester all of the hours taken in the averaging and the actual method have to be degree applicable hours. For the student-athlete that is in their fifth year of eligibility it would be very rare that this legislation would apply because progress-towards-degree would then be towards the sixth year of competition. There is -- and I will be shot if I'm wrong by staff but I'll take that chance, I believe in the legislation currently in your last two semesters of enrollment there's currently a legislative exception that would allow you to use hours towards any degree. So in that gray shirt or red shirt or whatever year you want to call it, if that's what your opposition is I don't think that's a valid opposition because, 1, progress-towards-degree would apply towards that sixth year of competition, and, 2, there's currently legislative exceptions. I believe that this proposal allows for the exploration of hours in those first two years when that exploration is important. It eliminates the term averaging but it still allows you to be eligible if you have a cumulative total of 48 credit hours, and I'm not doing the math in my head but it's in your documentation for quarter hours. I believe this legislation is a good piece of legislation. I believe that it puts student-athletes more firmly on that Path to Graduation and I would urge you to support this legislation.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 7.

DELEGATE DEBBIE NARANG (*University of Alaska-Anchorage*): Thank you, my name is Debbie Narang. I'm with the University of Alaska-Anchorage and I'm an FAR. I wanted to speak in opposition of this simply for eligibility, flexibility of academic advising. I don't call taking 18 credits a semester the senior year and taking 12 per semester junior year cheating. I think it's actually very prudent for our majors to take a lot of credits when the courses are quite easy, and when they get into their major and they are doing Introduction to Mathematical Proof they have a little more time to focus on that more rigorous study. Similar situations might occur for a student who is in an internship or perhaps wants to do undergraduate research and they would like more time in that semester to focus on fewer credits. So although I think it's a fantastic guideline to go for 24, 27, even 30 a semester, the legislation is sort of one size fits all. And because of that and in support of our local SAAC who voted unanimously against it, I will oppose this legislation.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Any further discussion? Hearing no further discussion. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 18. Please use your voting machines to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-18 passes. We move to Proposal No. 19. Proposal No. 19 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2016 for student-athletes initially enrolling in a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2016. Microphone 8.

DELEGATE JIM GAUDINO (*Central Washington University*): Thank you, sir, I'm Jim Gaudino, President of Central Washington University and a proud member of the Great Northwest Athletic Conference. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2014-19.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE JIM GAUDINO (*Central Washington University*): About one in nine of our Division II student-athletes is a transfer from a two-year college. This is an obviously significant portion of our student-athlete population and I, like I think everyone in this room, are proud, join them in being proud to provide the educational and athletic opportunities for these young student-athletes. Division II made the decision in 2010 to not collect two-year transfer data due to the administrative burden on our campus staff. However, the Research Committee and the NCAA research staff have concluded that the Division I two-year transfer data is statistically similar to the Division II data and could be a predictor of the Division II two-year transfer behaviors. Unfortunately I must report that our Division II data shows that transfer student-athletes from two-year colleges do not perform as well in the classroom as do their counterparts who are non-transfers or who are transfers from four-year colleges. With the recently announced decrease in the Academic Success Rate, it is important to note that the data include an increased number of two-year college transfer students. Student-athletes who transferred to D-II from a two-year college are 35 percent more likely to be academically ineligible after their first year than are non-transfers and four-year college transfers. And their Academic Success Rate of only 60 percent is 13 percent points below that of non-transfers and 10 points below that of four-year college transfers. Proposal 2014-19 will increase the likelihood that these young men and women are successful at our Division II institutions by strengthening the minimum academic requirements in three areas that the data show are related to academic success at our four-year institutions. By requiring two-year transfers to, 1, have an increased grade point average, 2, transferable science credits, and, 3, by limiting the number of physical education activity credits that can boost GPAs with nonacademic work, we will better ensure that transfers from two-year colleges are prepared for the academic rigor they will face in Division II institutions. This proposal also maintains the value of an Associate's degree. Student-athletes who demonstrate the academic ability and discipline necessary to earn their two-year college degree will still be automatically eligible in Division II provided that the student-athlete attend a two-year college as a full-time student for a minimum of two semesters or three quarters. I believe the August 1, 2016, effective date provides notice to two-year college students who are considering transferring to a Division II institution in the near future. If adopted, the proposed changes will apply to two-year college transfer student-athletes who initially enroll in Division II institutions on or after August 1, 2016. I ask that you please join me in support of proposal 2014-19.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, I call the question. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 19. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-19 passes. We move then to Proposal No. 20. Proposal No. 20 is a roll call vote with an effective date of June 15, 2014. There will be two votes on this proposal. The June 15, 2014, effective date will be considered first by paddle vote, and it needs two-thirds approval to pass. After the effective date vote, we will then have a discussion on the proposal followed by a roll call vote on the merits of Proposal No. 2014-20. Microphone No. 9.

DELEGATE ROBERT WYATT (*Coker College*): Thank you, President O'Brien. I'm Robert Wyatt, president of Coker College and member of the South Atlantic Conference and the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move proposal 2010-14.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE ROBERT WYATT (*Coker College*): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move the effective date of Proposal No. 2014-20 which is June 15, 2015.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE ROBERT WYATT (*Coker College*): This proposal has an effective date of June 15, 2014. The effective date will allow institutions to begin operating under the new legislation during the summer following the convention.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there any other discussions with regard to the effective date? Hearing none, I call the question. It is now time for our paddle vote on the June 15, 2014, effective date for Proposal No. 2014-20. All in favor, please raise your paddles. Thank you. All opposed, please raise your paddles. Thank you. Abstentions. Thank you. The effective date is passed, June 15, 2014.

DELEGATE ROBERT WYATT (*Coker College*): As is one of the goals of the Presidents Council Ease of Burden package, Proposal No. 2014-20 will help reduce the burden of compliance administrators and coaches by eliminating some of the restrictions related to official and unofficial visits. The recommended changes within this proposal are all recommendations that were considered as part of Proposal No. 2013-7 at last year's conventions. The recommendation in the current proposal include those pieces of Proposal No. 2013-7 that were less controversial and had a significant amount of consensus from the membership. One major difference between the proposal at the 2013 Convention and this set of proposed changes is in regard to the length of an official visit. Note that Proposal No. 2014-20 does not amend the 48-hour period of an official visit. At last year's convention and during feedback over the past year, the membership spoke clearly in its desire to maintain the current 48-hour requirement. However, Proposal No. 2014-20 amends the way Division II institutions conduct certain elements of official and unofficial visits, especially related to meals and parking on unofficial visits. It's important to note the changes outlined in the proposal are permissive in nature. For example, the proposal does not require institutions to provide more meals on official visits or to provide meals off campus on unofficial visits. Rather, institutions will be able to determine what arrangements work best for visits on campus. The remaining changes in the proposal regarding complimentary admission to conference tournaments and providing travel expenses to prospective student-athletes to participate in a camp or clinic in conjunction with an official visit are designed to create further consistency with the legislation. For these reasons please join me in support of the proposal 2014-20. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Any further discussion on the motion? Hearing none, I call the question. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 20. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-20 passes. We move now to Proposal No. 21. Proposal No. 21 is a roll call vote with an effective date of June 15, 2014. There will be two votes on this proposal. The June 15, 2014, effective date will be considered first by paddle vote, and it needs two-thirds approval to pass. After the effective date vote, we will then have discussion on the proposal followed by a roll call vote on the merits of the Proposal No. 20. Microphone No. 1.

DELEGATE ROBIN CAPEHART (*West Liberty University*): Mr. President, my name is Robin Capehart, I'm the President of the West Liberty University, member of the Mountain East Conference and I'm

also a member of the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I would move for proposal 2014-21.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE ROBIN CAPEHART (*West Liberty University*): Mr. President, on behalf of the Presidents Council, I move the effective date of Proposal No. 2014-21 which is June 15, 2014.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second. Discussion on the effective date.

DELEGATE ROBIN CAPEHART (*West Liberty University*): The proposal has an effective date of June 15, 2014. The effective date will allow prospective student-athletes entering their junior year in high school 2014 to participate on official visits starting on June 15.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Any further discussion on the effective date? Hearing none, it is now time for a paddle vote on the June 15, 2014, effective date for Proposal No. 2014-21. All in favor, please raise your paddles, thank you; all opposed, please raise your paddles, thank you; abstentions, thank you. The effective date passes.

DELEGATE ROBIN CAPEHART (*West Liberty University*): Mr. President, and members of convention, Proposal No. 2014-21 would align the first permissible date for official visits with other recruiting functions that take place on campus, such as try-outs of high school prospective student-athletes, telephone calls, in-person contacts and will reduce the monitoring burden for our athletic administrators. This proposal retains an academic requirement for official visits by requiring prospective student-athletes to present a current transcript prior to the official visit. This proposed requirement is more appropriate than the current requirement of requiring a standardized test score since high school juniors in most cases may not have taken a standardized test. Institutions would retain discretion as to when it's appropriate to have prospective student-athletes take an official visit and would not be required to allow official visits during the junior year. This proposal does not have a financial impact on institutions as prospective student-athletes would still only be permitted to take one official visit to an institution prior to high school graduation. I would ask on behalf of Presidents Council that you join me in supporting Proposal No. 2014-21.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 1 -- decided not to. Any further discussion on the motion? Hearing no further discussion I call the vote. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 2014-21. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any vote still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-21 passes. It's now time to move to Proposal No. 22. Proposal No. 22 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2014, for any academic award issued and/or renewed August 1, 2014, and thereafter. Microphone No. 4.

DELEGATE LINDA BLEICKEN (*Armstrong Atlantic State University*): Good morning, President O'Brien. I'm Linda Bleicken, President of Armstrong Atlantic State University and a proud member of the Peach Belt Conference representing the Presidents Council. On behalf of Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2014-22.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE LINDA BLEICKEN (*Armstrong Atlantic State University*): Following the 2010 Division II Presidents and Chancellors Summit, Division II embarked on an effort to identify ways to ease the burden

of compliance on Division II institutions. In addition, results from the recently completed Division II Membership Census reveal that more than 8 in 10 compliance administrators believe that the initiative to ease administrative burdens is among the five most important characteristics of Division II. Proposal No. 2014-22 is a continuation of this effort. Proposal No. 2014-22 will deregulate the requirements for awarding and renewing academic awards that are exempt from financial aid limits. If an institution awards a student-athlete an academic award based on established criteria applicable for academic awards to all students at the institution, and that student-athlete meets progress-toward-degree requirements, then the award will not count against the student-athlete's full grant in aid or the institution's financial aid limits. Because compliance administrators will no longer have to verify that the student-athlete met legislative national requirements for the award to be exempt, this simplifies Division II's financial aid legislation. Please join with me and the Presidents Council in support of Proposal No. 2014-22.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you, further discussion? Microphone 3.

DELEGATE JERRY HUGHES (*University of Central Missouri*): Jerry Hughes, Director of Athletics, University of Central Missouri. I would like to make a motion to refer this proposal back to the Management Council.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Is there a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE JERRY HUGHES (*University of Central Missouri*): I understand why this proposal is under the Ease of Burden package and I get why it was placed there and our compliance officers are truly overworked, but I do believe that this legislation has some potential unintended consequences to the Division II partial grant and aid scholarship package, and I would like for the Management Council to study this proposal as it relates to our total financial aid packages in Division II.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Further discussion on the motion to refer? And this takes precedence. Further discussion? Microphone 1.

DELEGATE ALAN PATTERSON (*Conference Carolinas*): Alan Patterson, Commissioner, Conference Carolinas. First I'd like to note that personally I appreciate the length that Earl Edwards has gone to to provide us the San Diego weather, thank you very much. I had initially made some notes to speak against the original proposal but they certainly applied to the amendment or the proposal on the floor at this point and I expressed this on behalf of the Conference Carolinas. In a perfect noncompetitive world the legislation is of benefit and reflects positively on all of us. In the competitive world of today's athletics, it begs to be studied as a means of creating advantage. Current legislation sets a consensus standard for all that encourages recruitment of students that demonstrate academic superiority. Coaches know the standards, recruit with that in mind, and work with financial aid staffs within an accepted equivalency accepted construct. Unintended, the very possible unintended consequences of this proposed legislation, I believe, include, 1, the financial aid staff and/or committees receive encouragement from coaches that those with equal academic talent but greater athletic talent receive special consideration; 2, the current high standard of the academic qualification that includes designation of not counting towards equivalencies will be diluted or removed. We do have academic scholarships that are given that do not meet the standards we currently have in NCAA Division II, and, 3, those whose competitive juices are so strong that any advantage possible is used in pursuit of victory will find this an opportunity to structure academic aid in a way to advance competitive imbalance. At this point there is little data to support the creation and implementation of this 146 piece of legislation. Without that foundation of information Conference Carolinas cannot support the original proposal. Rather we would encourage that we wait for a proposal submitted that has the comprehensive data that would support movement forward.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone 3.

DELEGATE KENT WEISER (*Emporia State University*): Kent Weiser, Director of Athletics, Emporia State University. I support the legislation. I do not support the referral, reference back to the Management Council. This, as I read it, is clearly an academic award available to all students. I look at this as a student-athlete welfare issue. Our current situation is we have student-athletes that as students would qualify for an award, an academic award from the institution, but cannot receive it because that would push equivalency limits either personally or more importantly team wise over the set limits. So all this I see is asking to treat student-athletes like students and let them keep their academic awards that the university would give to any student.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 3.

DELEGATE CHUCK AMBROSE (*University of Central Missouri*): Chuck Ambrose, President, University of Central Missouri and I want to speak in favor of the motion to refer. As a former President of Pfeiffer University and now president of University of Central Missouri the prevalence of leverage in aid and discounting tuition, its impact on our net tuition revenue and the opportunities as Commissioner Patterson stated to have significant impact beyond just easing the burden for compliance and recording should be looked at with deep intent. So I strongly support the request to send this back to the Management Council and get some additional data.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Further discussion? And the discussion is on the motion to refer back to Management Council. Any further discussion? Hearing no further discussion we'll call the question. It is now time to decide whether to refer back to the Management Council Proposal No. 2014-22. Please use your voting machines to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any vote still being cast will not be registered. The proposal to refer Proposal No. 2014-22 back to the Management Council is approved. We will move now then to Proposal No. 23. Proposal No. 23 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2014. Microphone No. 6.

DELEGATE DEBBIE FORD (*University of Wisconsin-Parkside*): Debbie Ford, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, proud member of the Great Lakes Valley Conference and member of the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2014-23.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE DEBBIE FORD (*University of Wisconsin-Parkside*): The goal of this Association-wide legislative proposal is two-fold; to deter student-athlete street drug/nonperformance enhancing substance abuse and to provide an opportunity to change behavior and support student-athletes to return to play. This proposal primarily addresses the use of marijuana and synthetic cannabinoids. Although heroin is also considered a street drug per NCAA legislation, no student-athlete, and let's hope we never have a student-athlete, but no student-athlete has ever tested positive for heroin in an NCAA drug test. Several other drugs that may be commonly considered street drugs by the general population fall under NCAA banned substance classes that are considered performance enhancing and would continue to result in a 365-day withholding penalty and the loss of a season of competition. This legislative proposal does not condone drug use; instead, the withholding penalty of half a season, which is still a strong deterrent, will allow member schools to provide more help to student-athletes who need it and should result in reduced use with intervention. Division II currently only tests for street drugs at NCAA championships. Beginning with the 2014-15 academic year, Division II is scheduled to begin testing for street drugs as part of the year-round drug testing program. More widespread testing demonstrates Division II's commitment to the health and well-being of student-athletes. Intervention contributes to deterrence, as student-athletes are more likely to avoid repeat use if they are supported in their effort and are motivated to not use if they can return to play. This proposed change is in the best interest of the student-athlete health and well-being. Please join me and the members of the Presidents Council in support of proposal 2014-3.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Any further discussion? Microphone No. 6.

DELEGATE B.J. POMROY (*Shepherd University*): B.J. Pomroy, Director of Athletics at Shepherd University. I would speak against this proposal and again mention street drugs not specific to marijuana which I think has captured the national attention, and though there has not been a heroin test, speaking from our campus who has had heroin overdose it is regaining its popularity within the student population. As a public school who has a zero tolerance drug test policy in the four years I've been at Shepherd we've only had one positive test for marijuana during that time and to me that shows that our drug testing, as stringent as it is meeting the national championship standard, is a deterrent through the activity and behavior despite the fact that the nation's prevailing attitudes seem to be shifting through popular vote and other intentions, the idea of we are being permissive in saying we support use of illicit substances if most of the nation by passing this. Student-athletes who are dismissed from the team -- student-athletes who fail a drug test are likely to be dismissed from a team, lose their athletic aid and drop from the school whether it's a 50 percent penalty or one-year suspension. I feel as though this proposal should be defeated.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 5.

DELEGATE KAREN STROMME (*University of Minnesota-Duluth*): Karen Stromme, University of Minnesota-Duluth. On behalf of the Management Council, I also want to speak in support of Proposal No. 2014-23. The Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport, which hears drug test appeals, believes this 50 percent sanction for street drug use provides for a meaningful and appropriate sanction and distinguishes between how we address potential addiction and how we address cheating. Student-athletes tell us they use street drugs for the same reasons other college students do -- to deal with anxiety and stress -- and the interventions for this use should address those motivations differently than we do cheating through the use of performance enhancing drugs. CSMAS found that most student-athletes who tested positive for marijuana and received the full one-year penalty did not return to their sport and left them less likely to graduate. Street drug use undermines student-athlete health and academic success and encouraging student-athletes to remain in a structured environment where they can receive support for drug use issues increases the likelihood that they will persist to graduation. Please join me in support of Proposal No. 2014-23.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Microphone No. 3.

DELEGATE MEGAN DAVIS: (*Great Lakes Valley Conference*) Good morning, my name is Megan Davis from the Great Lakes Valley Conference and I'm a member of the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee speaking on behalf of all Division II student-athletes. The Division II SAAC supports Proposal No. 2014-23 for the following reasons: This proposal not only embodies the Division's concern with the growth and acceptance of street drugs among student-athletes but promotes student-athlete well-being in several ways. First, studies show student-athletes that test positive for a street drug and then become subject to the penalty under the current legislation often never return to athletics and frequently withdraw from the institution. Based on our experiences on campus a reduced penalty will likely increase the chances that a student-athlete who tests positive will remain on campus during their period of ineligibility. If student-athletes remain on campus then institutions will have a better opportunity to intervene and provide a support system through education, counseling and/or treatment. In addition, student-athletes will have a built-in support system at that institution from their friends, their coaches or professors that could provide encouragement and assistance throughout the rehabilitation process. Ultimately the student-athlete could become a positive role model for fellow students that struggle with similar addictions and although this proposal may appear to disregard the severity of abusing street drugs by lessening the penalty for a positive test, the benefits of this proposal far outweigh any negative implications associated with this concern. Under this proposal a student-athlete who tests positive for a street drug will be required to sit out for 50 percent of their season of competition in all sports and will still have to provide a negative drug test to remain eligible. In the opinion of us student-athletes this will continue to be a very severe penalty

and we encourage you to support this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you. Further discussion? Hearing no further discussion I call the question. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 23. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," press the No. 2 to vote "no" or the No. 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed. Any votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-23 passes. We now move to Proposal No. 24. Proposal No. 24 is a roll call vote with an effective date of August 1, 2014. Microphone 8.

DELEGATE TOM HAAS (*Grand Valley State University*): Mr. Chair, good morning again. I'm Tom Haas, President, Grand Valley State University, a member of Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2014-24.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Do I have a second? I have a second.

DELEGATE TOM HAAS (*Grand Valley State University*): Thank you, Mr. Chair. The goal of this Association-wide legislative proposal designating a team physician is the lynchpin to the safety package encouraging a reliable sports medicine foundation at every member institution. Though most D-II institutions already designate a team physician, this legislation will assure that all institutions are required to do so by NCAA regulation and legislation. Protecting the health, safety and well-being of our student-athletes is a top priority. This proposal establishes additional safeguards to further protect our student-athletes. Please join me in support of Proposal No. 2014-24. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: Thank you, is there any further discussion? Hearing none, I call the question. It is now time to decide Proposal No. 2014-24. Please use your voting machine to cast your roll call vote by pressing the No. 1 to vote "yes," No. 2 to vote "no" or 3 to abstain. Please vote now. The polls will close in five seconds. The polls are now closed and votes still being cast will not be registered. Proposal No. 2014-24 passes. Congratulations, 24 proposals. At this time I would now like to open the Window of Reconsideration for all of the proposals we just considered. Any delegate who voted on the prevailing side of any proposal may move for reconsideration. We will pause for a couple of minutes to give delegates who want a chance to organize and then I will open the floor for reconsideration. If you choose to leave, please take your voting unit and smartcard to the tables outside the ballroom where you received your voting unit. As a reminder, additional voting may occur during the Window of Reconsideration. Only the delegates appointed by your institution or conference as the voting delegate is permitted to vote. Let's watch a video during the period of reconsideration. (Video is played at this time.)

CHAIRMAN PAT O'BRIEN: I'd like to call us back to order. Are there any motions for reconsideration? I see no motions for reconsideration. Thank you. The Window of Reconsideration for 2014 proposals is now closed. Here before we go I do want to say thank you to all of the members of the various committees that we have in the NCAA. I also want to congratulate Karen Stromme who is coming in as the Chair of Management Council, Tom Haas, who is coming in as Chair of Presidents Council. After seven years on Presidents Council it is now my time to roll off and hence head back to Texas. I officially then close this 2014 business session. See you in Washington.

SATURDAY SESSION JANUARY 18, 2014

(The Division III Business Session of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held at the Hilton San Diego Bayfront Hotel, San Diego, California, on Saturday, January 18, 2014, was called to order at 8:00 o'clock a.m., with Division III Presidents Council Chairman, Jack Ohle, presiding.)

Chairman Ohle: If you can find your seat at your table with your conference, we will begin. If we could get the doors closed on the far end, that would be helpful. Good morning and happy anniversary. I almost was going to sing, and then I thought -- I checked with my wife and she said, "No, Jack, don't do that." Welcome to the Business Session. We have had an opportunity to meet and I have met many of you personally, and I have known you over the years that we have been involved in the NCAA. I am Jack Ohle, and I am president of Gustavus Adolphus College in Minnesota, and a proud member of the MIAC, which is seated way back there. I guess being Chair of the Council doesn't bring anybody up closer. This is a great day. As Chair of the Council, I am also the person who chairs the Business Session, so I'll look forward to our opportunities. Joining me on the dais this morning are Terry Rupert. Terry is the Director of Athletics at the Wilmington College in Ohio, who also chairs the Division III Management Council. Sharon Herzberger, who is the vice chair and then will be taking the gavel at the end of this meeting as the Chair for the next year. Georgana Taggart, our parliamentarian at the end of the table, from Mount St. Joseph. Dan Dutcher, our Vice President of Division III, Louise McCleary, Director of Division III, Jeff Myers, Director of Academic and Membership Affairs, and Brandy Hataway, Associate Director of Academic and Membership Affairs. We have some very special guests with us here on the dais, and I will introduce them very shortly. Finally, I want to remember the court reporter who is here with us and the person who will take down all of this information. Make sure when you come to a microphone that you state your name, state your college and your affiliation before you speak, as you speak into the microphone. would again ask you to please shut off your cell phone, and make sure it is either on silent or vibrate mode. Our first guest this morning is the NCAA president, Mark Emmert, who will be joining us here for the 40th celebration. He will share his thoughts with us about the Association in general, and give us an update on the ongoing Division I Governance Structure and the discussions that they are having. At the Opening Business Session, I had an opportunity to participate in that and shared my thoughts a little bit about the NCAA Association. There is more in common about the three divisions than we probably think. It is important for us as leaders in the Division III and in the Association to remember our partners in D-II and D-I. I think President Emmert is doing a fantastic job of bringing us back and centering us on the student-athlete, and how important that is. We spend our hours and days on a campus with student-athletes, and with the other students, and understand the importance of the integration of athletics and academics. President Emmert understands that having come from a presidency and an opportunity to work with students in his earlier life. Mark, we thank you for being here today for this 40th celebration. Please come to the podium and share your thoughts. *(Applause)*

President Emmert: Well, thank you, Jack, and good morning to everyone. I know by now you have had to suffer through a few days in San Diego. We are terribly sorry about that. I know you are dying to get on airplanes and whisk your way back to the snow and ice, if you are going there. At the close of this meeting, you will get a chance to do that. This has been a really, really busy week for the Association. There has been a remarkable amount of discussion and dialogue about virtually every issue involving intercollegiate athletics. There has been conversations across all three divisions about significant rule changes and policy changes, and economic challenges, and all the things that you confront on your campuses and in your conferences. It has been delightful for me, as I know it has been for all of the leaders involved, to hear the consistency of the message again and again about emphasizing and re-emphasizing that this is all about developing young men and young women and student-athletes as students and scholars in helping them move on in their lives and careers after

they finish playing games on our campuses. The three divisions have different models on how they do that. They have different approaches to competitiveness and the emphasis they may place on sports or the resources that are available for them, but as Jack also said, what has been really pleasant is to hear the united front that all three divisions have on trying to take care of athletes. If you were at the Opening Session, that all three of the Division Presidential Chairs spoke at, and the Executive Committee Chair, Lou Anna Simon. She said something that really struck a lot of people as a poignant reminder. If you look at what is in the media today, and if you ask the average citizen out there about college sports, they immediately have a vision in their mind, and that vision is what they see on television. It is BCS football in Division I, and it is pretty much those same schools and a handful of members in basketball, and that's it. That is college sports. If you ask them what is going right and what is going wrong with college sport, they say, and by the way we did a survey of people so we know these are not just speculations. They will say something like, "I love the games and I think they are really entertaining, and it has never been more exciting. I really think it is great." Then you ask them questions about academic focus, and they say, "Well, you know these kids, they really don't want to be in school. They are just there to play ball and to get in the NBA and the NFL." We all understand the shame of that. The shame of it is even in Division I, when they are watching TV, they are seeing 3 percent of Division I's student athletes. They are missing 97 percent. When they watch the TV and pay attention to that, they are missing almost all of Division II and all of Division III, which means they are missing about 95 1/2, I have not done the math, maybe 99 3/4 percent of all of our student-athletes. Lou Anna Simon said, you know, we are not an association for the one percent. We are an association for the 99 percent. That is a popular phrase today in economic terms. We want the one percent who have the ability and the interest to go play professional sports to be successful, so why wouldn't we want somebody to go chase their dreams and be successful at it? That's great. We all want that. But that's not for whom we should be writing the rules. That is not for whom we should be placing expectations on ourselves. That is not for whom the Association exists. It exists for the 99 percent. It exists for the kids who use these games to develop their own skills, use these games to have fun; use these games to advance their own skills as leaders and followers and teammates and communicators, in all the things that are going to allow them to go out in the world and be successful. Of course, that doesn't strike anybody in this room as unusual. That is why you do these things. That's why we are committed to athletics. Along with that, of course, comes responsibilities that we have. We have got to make sure we are doing everything we can on our campuses and our conferences, and the national office to support and develop those 99 percent, that we are taking care of them and providing them with the best health and safety options we know how to give in the real science and the real evidence of the day, that we are providing them with the same kind of sport on the field that we provided in the classroom, because we are going to say you will come to my college and be excellent. We mean excellence in all things that we have got to do, the best we can to help them. We have got to sometimes occasionally protect them from themselves and even from us so that we don't place too much emphasis on their sport, too much emphasis on the competition, so that they recognize there are other things in life that they need to be worried about as well. That is why there is a teacher-student relationship, so we can help and educate them, and all that. You-all get that clearly. I understand that and I am delighted to have met with your presidents, with your Management Council, with your students during these meetings, because I heard all that come back up again and again and again. It was great. In the rest of the Association, Division I, as you know, is in the midst of rethinking how they do governance and how they make their own decisions. For example, sometimes they have said in the past two days you know what would happen if we get everybody in one big room and we all vote together? "Oh," they said, "that could never happen. That is impossible. That would be chaos. We can't do that." We did that when Ced Dempsey was running the NCAA. By the way, I have discovered a new definition of happiness. It is being former head of the NCAA, right? Here is a man that you see the smile on this man's face. He left the NCAA and moved to La Jolla, California. Now, there is a wise man if ever there was. You know, we do have to make sure that in Division I that they can make decisions that support those 99 percent as well, and they have challenges there, and they are looking at how to do it. They are trying to figure out how to put more student voice in their process, how to put more practitioner voice in that process. They are probably going to create something that looks a lot like your Management Council in many respects. They are trying to figure that out, and they are struggling with it. The implications for Divisions II and III, I think of all of that will probably be a Division I that is more anxious to see what you do and interested in

collaboration and cooperation, and trying to focus more on the shared values that we all have in college sport and how that all fits together. I think that is going to be a very, very positive outcome. They have taken as part of their base conversation that they don't want to mess with the division of resources in Division I, obviously important to all of you. I think more importantly is for you-all to recognize even if they wanted to mess with it, they don't have the authority to. That authority resides in the Executive Committee. The people who sit on the Executive Committee, that is who makes the budgetary decisions, what is best in the bylaws of the Association. So, we have no expectation that that is going to change. We don't have any expectation that the really important things that D-I members like access to championships will change. Everybody is trying to hold that steady and not mess with that, because they know how important it is, whether it touch on that for all the members. You will see change. You will see a different governing model, but hopefully you will see one that re-emphasizes those core values that you worry about, too, and that you talk about right here as they wrestle with the issues. Thank you all for taking time to be here this week. Thank you for the time and energy you put into intercollegiate activities. For many of you in this room, this is not your day job. You are here because you value college sports. It is important on your campus, and you see what it does for your student-athletes. The Association is a voluntary Association and it only works if you have volunteers. Thank you for volunteering and thank you for helping us. *(Applause)*

Chairman Ohle: Mark needs to move on to some of the other activities of the Association. We want to thank him again for his being here for the opening of our celebration, and the opportunity to hear his thoughts on some of the reorganization aspects of Division I, but also as importantly to reaffirm that Division II and Division III are doing some things that are very important for the entire Association. We appreciate that, Mark. Thank you. As I said when we began, this is a milestone for Division III as we celebrate our 40th anniversary. I thought I would ask for a show of hands for everyone that this is your first convention. Look around and hold them up for a little bit. This is your first of 40. How many have been here at least 10? Isn't that great? Look around. How many of you have been here 20? Wow. How many have been here 30? Has anybody been here since we began the Association as we now know it? Ced has been. *(Applause)*

We have a few more. You deserve a star. You are the foundation of this organization, and I will say a few words about Ced in a minute. You are the foundation of what we are doing. You made the rules, and we are playing by those rules. You ask your athletes to do that all the time. It is important for us now to think about the excitement of Division III as we look now beyond that 40-year horizon and look into the next 40 years and how important that will be for intercollegiate athletics. In August, we observed the start of the 40th anniversary. We observed the 1973 vote that reorganized the NCAA into three divisions and created what is now Division III, the Association's largest membership division. It was 40 years ago this month that we first cast votes and otherwise did important business as a newly-formed membership division that they consisted of 233 institutions. We are now 450. We formally voted during the 1974 convention not to award athletic scholarships, the hallmark of who we are, and to give our students the autonomy to decide for themselves who would be eligible to compete in varsity sports. Our schools have that autonomy today. That is extremely important to us. These are the bedrock principles that continue to make us unique in intercollegiate athletics. The 1974 convention also was, as is every convention, a time to celebrate and honor our student athletes as we talk about achievements, not only in competition but also in the classroom, and as students fully involved in campus and community life. Upon gathering for the 1974 convention, just up the coast in San Francisco, we had just crowned our first football champion, Wittenberg University. *(Applause)* There they are, winner of the Amos Alonzo Stagg Bowl. Now, I am going to take aside here really quickly, and I am a little nostalgic myself as I think about it, because it wasn't 1974, but it was 1969 when the first Stagg Bowl was ever played. It was in recognition of the 100th year of football in intercollegiate sport. I was one of those young guys who was on that coaching staff, and we won that first Stagg Bowl in 1969. *(Applause)*

I was really a young man then. During the Honors Luncheon 40 years ago, one of the first NCAA awards of Valor was presented to Ursinus College men's basketball team, which had responded heroically to the explosion in a motel restaurant where they were staying during a road trip. Some of you will remember that. Seventeen members and their coaches rescued 14 people, including 12 who were injured, using table tops and doors

to evacuate those victims from the building. That was valor. Through the years, the NCAA has honored student-athletes like in 1977 Today's Top Five Selections, Gerald Huesken, an All-American football player with a 4.0 student-athlete at Susquehanna, who was the poetry editor of the campus literary journal. Joan Lange Pfinscrاف, one of the first two women to receive an NCAA Post-Graduate Scholarship after serving as captain of the Allegheny's 1976 swimming team, five years before the first Division III women's championships. Harry Smith, the former Central College football athlete and a 1998 Silver Anniversary Award winner was recognized for his studies in communications and theater which led him to a distinguished career at CBS and now at NBC News. And just last year, distance runner Liz Phillips, from Washington University in St. Louis, who followed up her selection as the 2012 Woman of the Year for the NCAA with recognition last January in Texas as a Today's Top Ten Award winner. And, as we have been learning in the 40 series of anniversary profiles that have been published in the ncaa.org, there are other former student-athletes who have brought recognition and pride to Division III, such as recent Securities & Exchange Commission chair Mary Schapira, a three-sport athlete at Franklin & Marshall; on the current White House Chief of Staff Denis O'Donough, who was a standout football player at St. John's in Minnesota. Jennifer Harris Trosper, an MIT volleyball standout who today is a team member of the team at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory exploring Mars. We could go on and spend all morning, and I could ask each of you to stand up to recognize one or two or three of your student-athletes that have done some marvelous things in their lives. Without a doubt, this convention is a time for important legislative decisions as well as recognition of athletes. For example, it was 10 years ago this month that we joined together to take a closer look at our distinctive Division III philosophy, and voted to shorten playing and practice seasons, eliminate red shirting, and to implement the financial aid reporting process 10 years ago and to really think about how we can make it the best we can for our student-athletes and the coaches and the others on our campuses. But probably the most enjoyable moments at every convention are those times we set aside to honor our student-athletes' accomplishments, whether during their time on our campuses or in their post-graduate pursuits. And as it happens, this 40th anniversary year reveals to us a number of milestones in student-athlete achievement. I think the NCAA is doing a great job in making sure we hold up these athletes. In a few minutes, we will hear remarks from one such accomplished former student athlete. But first, we also want to acknowledge another milestone that means a lot to those of us who serve in the governance of Division III and of the NCAA. Twenty years ago this month, a graduate of a Division III member school, Albion College, delivered his first address to the Association's membership as the NCAA's newly select president. It was the beginning of Cedric Dempsey's nine-year tenure as our chief executive officer, an eventful presidency in which he oversaw the restructuring of the Association in 1997, resulting in a stronger Division III. Through the reorganization, Division III retained its one-school/one-vote approach to decision-making, but gave institutional presidents a strong leadership role through the establishment of the Presidents Council, which I have been pleased to chair for the past year. We also gained greater financial security to support our championships programs, as well as annual revenue allocations that have allowed us to establish a variety of non-championship programs to better support student-athlete well-being and success. Through his tenure, Ced was unwavering in his support for our student-athletes, not surprising, considering his own background as a three-sport student-athlete at Albion, a Division III school. And then as a graduate student, coach and dean of men at his alma mater. Just before he left the NCAA presidency, a headline in the NCAA News called Ced "the student-athlete's president" -- what a great title -- and for all of his accomplishments, he always was quick to place initiatives supporting student-athletes at the top of his own list of achievements. So, it is most appropriate to have Ced with us this morning to participate in this year's recognition of Division III's 40th anniversary, and in our never-ending celebration of our student-athlete. Please join me in welcoming Ced Dempsey. *(Applause)*

REMARKS BY CEDRIC DEMPSEY

Mr. Dempsey: Good morning. You may not have thought I was very smart when I was at the NCAA, but I live in San Diego. We welcome you to our fine city and the Chamber of Commerce wanted me to let you know that the weather next time will be a little better. Thank you, President Ohle. You didn't mention when I was at Albion, we beat Ohio Northern 14 to 7, and I will never forget on January 1, 1954, on New Year's

day, I played basketball at Ohio Northern. Can you imagine doing that on New Year's day today? And we won that one, too. I am so pleased and honored that you would ask me to come back and be with you today. You are my vision of intercollegiate sports, I want you to know that. I grew up in Division III and actually I grew up before Division III. I have been asked to do three things, I guess, this morning before we hear from our distinguished speaker. One is to talk a little bit about my experiences in Division III, and certainly at the college level as it was called when I was involved, and talk a little bit about the student-athlete involvement, and to introduce our main speaker. I will try to move through those quickly as I can. It is really hard, because it was 64 years ago that I first had to make a very important decision in my life, where to go to school? I was the first one in my family that had the opportunity to go to college, because I could throw a ball, bounce a ball and kick a ball, sometimes shoot a ball. In fact, I have one distinction in the NCAA manuals, if you want to look it up sometime. I think it was 1951 or '52 I was the number two rebounder in the United States. At six feet three and a 41 inch vertical jump, that is not too bad. But there is another part of that story. I played on a team that averaged 92 points a game and shot 33 percent. Those of you who don't know percentages, think through that, how many rebounds there were in a ball game? My dad wanted me to be a professional baseball player, and I did have a chance to sign out of high school with the Boston Red Sox as a shortstop. My coaches in high school really encouraged me to go on to college, and that's the first impact that I had of someone mentoring me about where I should go. I had an opportunity to play at the University of Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, Beloit, and it was my last game in basketball I played at Albion College in the quarter finals in the state tournament in Michigan. I was overwhelmed with the institution. I came from a little town of 800 people, and I thought that was the fit for me. So, I sacrificed those others to go to Albion. I met their basketball coach, who became my mentor, my second father, guided me all through his life, and I will never, never regret having gone to Albion. I knew I could play at the other level and that was not as important as the opportunity to participate that I had. I had also the opportunity to compete as indicated in football, basketball, baseball, which you can't do at a large school. I was able to do that back in those periods of time, and if I wasn't good at any of them, it gave me a chance to understand the meaning, I guess, of participating in sport. To me, there is no better laboratory of learning about life than competing in sports and being part of a team, being a part of the goals that you set for yourself, and it is with that I want to share just a couple of experiences that I had that helped mold, I guess, my thoughts and career. I am going to share with you experiences I had regarding diversity. I played on a very diverse team, where in the 1950s we had in basketball four kids that were minorities. In baseball, we had two, and it was kind of a special period of time for us at Albion to have that kind of experience. But I learned a great deal about diversity. I will cite real quick stories, if I can. We used to go south always to Kentucky. That doesn't seem very far south, but that was a long way from Michigan at that time. We had one minority player playing left field. He was harassed when we were playing Eastern Kentucky, and there were about 400 people at the game, and they all sat along the left field line and harassed him the whole game. We were so proud of him when he went five for five and shut them up pretty quickly. As a team, we were not allowed -- we did not stay in a motel because he was not allowed in a motel, so we all had cots and slept in the gymnasiums wherever we went in the south, one of my first exposures as a freshman at that time. I guess I had never identified and thought through that process. Then I had the opportunity to really begin to hit me when I was a senior in basketball. There was a minority athlete that played at Adrian College. He came in late and won. He was probably one of the best athletes at that time in the MIAA. I worked really hard defensively on him. He was six-five and he had a 41 inch jump, so he could take any players on the board really good. I worked really hard on and he had four charging fouls. He was out of the ball game. We were walking down to the other end of the floor, and the official carrying the ball walking a long side me to shoot the free throws, the official said, "Well, we finally got that black bastard out of here, didn't we?" Think of that; think of that. That is 1954. I was so shaken when I heard that, I called time out and I went over to the coach and I said, "I don't even want to shoot these free throws." I can't believe this experience I had. Fortunately, the official never worked in another college game as far as I know, and the coach was very involved in that. The other one I am close with in explaining why diversity became very important to me in my career and how it affected the NCAA. A young man I played with, who was an outstanding basketball player, again an African-American, was the leading scorer in the conference. My job was to get him involved. The only time I ever got to shoot, if I got it off the board, but he graduated with honors. He could not get a job. The Lansing High School, the coach helped him get a job at the high school as a janitor. That was 1953 when this happened. He said, "If you will come and work as a janitor for a year, maybe we can help you get a job." They did hire him the

next year, and he went on and got his Doctorate from Michigan State University, and became the first black state superintendent of schools in America. Those stories, I tell you because I think it illustrates what you have learned through sport. That's why I have always been an advocate of Division III. I think that is what you attempt to do, and in many cases we have been very successful in doing it. How did that apply when I got to the NCAA? When I got to the NCAA, we had 8 percent of our staff that were minorities. We had 22 percent that were females. When I left, we had 24 percent that were minorities and we had 49 percent of our administrators as females. That is what I learned at Albion and that was my commitment in trying to lead the association through that period in that area. There are many stories that I would like to share with you, but I am not the speaker in that sense, but it did illustrate to me as we talk about what are the values of sport, we all learned a great deal from that, and you think you are going to ask home played sports at that point? It will be interesting to see in Division III how many of you didn't have the opportunity to play. As a former student-athlete at Albion, I can identify with today's ideals in Division III institutions. One, discovery of potential. That coach I told you about that was my second father, he guided me when I graduated from college. I was married for a year and I had a job at Walhalla High School in Michigan to be the head basketball coach. I was 21 and to be the head coach I was so excited. I ran into his office, and said I am going to Walhalla High School. He said, "That is really a nice opportunity for you, but you are not going to take that job." Well, that is good. He said, "You are going to stay here and get your Master's degree." I must admit I think I am one of the four people in Albion history that ever got a Master's degree at Albion, but I did, and I stayed two years there, and I was now 23. I am offered the Adrian College basketball job, where I ran up the stairs and ran in the office and was so excited. Our first child was about to be born. I said, "Well, I have just been offered the Adrian basketball job." I was 23 years old and would be one of the youngest coaches in the country. He said, "That's really nice, but you are not going to take that job." I said, "I need the money." He said, "You are going to go and get your Doctorate. That job at Walhalla High School will probably still be there, the Adrian College job will probably still be there and there may be other opportunities for you." It was a struggle; it was a struggle. I went to the University of Illinois, and never had science at Albion. I had a great philosophy, and I thought I needed to get a good science background, and I ended up in classes with med students, and every time I would get down I wrote him a letter. We didn't have e-mail back in those days. I wrote him a letter, and he would always pump me up. When you talk about discovery of potential, I think he saw something in me that I never saw in myself. Certainly, that is one of the goals that we see emphasized in Division I, the development of life-long passions. I met with some of the interns from the NCAA the other night. We were talking about their future, and my best advice I could give them is whatever you do, have a passion for that; have a passion for what you are doing. I think it is an admirable goal for what we have in Division III. Also, dedication to post-graduate success. We are going to hear more about that very shortly from our main speaker. But those three principles, the three D's, if you will: discovery, development and dedication are underlined in Division III. In this 40th anniversary, Division III represents the heart and soul of the NCAA. I felt that before and maybe that is because I grew out of your institution. I still believe that. I just mentioned to Dan earlier, I think if I was back in a world of athletics -- one thing, you know, what happens when you get old, you finally have all the answers but no one asks you any questions. But if I did have the chance to go back and have questions, I would certainly emphasize what the mission of this group is. I don't know if you realize those new people here and 40 percent of the NCAA are Division III institutions. That is 40 percent of the student-athletes that compete in this country are former student-athletes in Division III. So, you do carry a strong voice of what athletics is all about and why we have athletics in our education. That's the one question I raise many times, and particularly in Division I. Why in the world do we have it? I am not sure they can still answer that question. It is unfortunate to see, I think, what is happening in Division I, but I said in 1997, when we federated into three divisions, the divisions that would prosper most would be Division II and Division III. I still believe that today. You have maintained your values and we compliment you on doing that. To the student-athletes, you know, you have a celebration today, too. It is not the 40 years, it is the 25 years. It was 25 years ago the NCAA established the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee where students began to have a greater voice in intercollegiate sports and on to where they are today, where they have a voting voice on we they are doing, and the steps that took place from that 25 years ago to where they are today, I compliment you. I remember the first time when students got on the floor of that group of people, over a thousand people, twelve hundred, when we all used to meet together, and the students got up and talked about what their visions were, what their needs were, and it is referred to as the student president, one that chaired the student-athlete welfare. I have never been not so proud

and I have been all over 58 campuses since I left the NCAA in 2004. One of the first things I always do is to look at the SAAC program, the leadership programs that exist on the campuses and see the enthusiasm of the student-athletes. I congratulate you today on your 25th anniversary as part of this Association. The history of involvement of institutional presidents continues as well today as we see on the dais up here. The leadership of Jack, who played at Ohio Northern football before embarking on a career that led him to the presidencies of Wartburg and at Gustavus Adolphus, where he is today. Leaders like Jack have been able to bring a student-athlete perspective to the work on behalf of Division III and as others have as well. One such individual is the president of one of Division III's newest members, Tori Murden McClure of Spalding University in Louisville, who is also here to help lead this celebration of the Division's 40th anniversary year. I am honored to have the opportunity to introduce President McClure this morning as the keynote speaker for our 40th anniversary celebration. Tori was a three-sport student-athlete at Smith College, graduating with a degree in psychology after serving as captain of the basketball team. She later earned advanced degrees in divinity, law and writing, but she didn't leave behind her love for an active and athletic life when she graduated from Smith. In 1989, she trekked 750 miles across Antarctica to become one of the first two women to ski cross-country to the South Pole. Then, in 1999, which is really amazing, she became the first woman to row solo across the Atlantic Ocean. She is today one of the hundreds of thousands of Division III student-athletes who discovered their potential, developed life-long passions and dedicated themselves not just to academics and athletics, but to service to society. Please join me in welcoming President Tori Murden McClure. (Applause)

KEYNOTE SPEAKER TORI MURDEN McCLURE

President McClure: I see I have been allotted 20 minutes for this presentation. I have timed it and it goes 19 minutes and 30 seconds. There isn't any laughter. We are here today to celebrate what is good about the NCAA. We are here to celebrate Division III. I am glad Mark Emmert left the room. The obvious place to begin this celebration is 16th Century Hungary. There is a village along the Danube River, called Kocs, K-o-c- s. In that village they built exquisite cages called coaches named for the city. The purpose of a coach was to carry someone from where they were to where they wanted to go. Coaches continued to take people from where they are to where they would like to go. Some coaches make a great deal of money doing that, but they are not in this room today. Most of them work for state universities, and we can't all work for the government. In Division III, we expect our coaches and administrators to be good teachers, mentors, tutors and guides. We look for leadership in the classic sense, character matters more than a winning record. The word "leader" is Indo European in origin. The part "lead" means path. The second part "dur" means finder. A leader is a pathfinder. Your leadership helps students to find their path, not just their athletic path, but their path in their broader lives. As a senior at Smith College, I received an award for being the outstanding senior athlete. This award was supposed to go to a student who embodied the ideals of a scholar athlete. I was not the best scholar and I was not the best athlete. The next morning I took that award to the office of Linda Molton, the same Linda Molton who would go on to serve as the athletic director at Clark University for 23 years. I told Linda I did not deserve the award. She agreed with me. Linda explained over the course of about a half hour that no one can live up to the ideals of the scholar athlete in the time frame of college experience. Such efforts, she described, require a lifetime. But she noted the path was a worthy one. The ideals of the scholar athlete were handed down to Division III from ancient Greece. Plato taught that a sound mind could only flourish in a strong and healthy body. We agree with him. It is fairly obvious. He believed that women should receive the same intellectual and physical education as men. We agree with him. Gender equity is at the best in Division III. Plato also taught us that women should exercise naked. I feel the need to point out that men in ancient Greece also exercised in the nude, and I am all for equity. We can end all those silly discussions about the clothing female athletes should or should not wear, and we could increase revenue at every level of the NCAA if everyone just went naked. Think of the money we would save on uniforms. After Smith College, I went on to divinity school at Harvard. During my last year, I took a little time off to ski 750 miles across the Antarctic to the geographic South Pole. I wrote my thesis on the Theology of Adventure. There were nine men and two women on that expedition. When we reached the South Pole, we counted to three, and we all touched the pole at the same time so we could each claim to have been the first, the first American to reach the South Pole by an overland route, the first woman to reach the South Pole, blah, blah, and so on.

After we touched the pole and after I had gone off to take care of our gear, the other woman on the trip took off her clothes and danced around the South Pole in her black lace Christian Dior underwear. Virtually, all the press coverage about our expedition focused on Shirley Metz in her underwear. Life magazine got 135 rolls of film from our expedition. The only picture they used was Shirley Metz in her underwear. I did not appear in any of the published photographs, but that woman in her underwear and I were describes respectively as the floozy and the nun. I am not a nun, I do lead a Catholic institution. I am just a little bit Presbyterian. One of my Harvard classmates attempting to come to my defense said, "Oh, no, Tori is just a braveless sex pot." I assure you he was being sarcastic. Yesterday, January 17th, was the 25th anniversary of our having reached the pole. For 25 years, as I have watched clothing come and go on other women, I have wondered whether our expedition to the South Pole would have received any press coverage at all if Shirley Metz, had kept her clothes on. Let us cover this nakedness and move on to amateurism. The Division III takes some pride in the preservation of a scholar athlete in his or her amateur status. Her notions of amateurism were inherited from Great Britain where higher education was reserved for white men, most of whom came from the upper classes. It was unseemly for gentlemen to be paid to engage in any sort of physical labor. Rules limiting participation to amateurs were designed to keep working men out of scholastic competition. The same was true in the United States. In 1907, Palmer Pierce described the NCAA as "a league of educated gentlemen." Whatever their rhetoric may be, money and male sporting achievements have always traveled together throughout human history. One of the earliest intercollegiate competitions in the United States was the Harvard-Yale boat race, which began in 1852. The eight-day all expense paid trip to the men of both crews was sponsored by the owner of a railroad, who helped to organize the race because he wanted people to travel to the race on his railroad. Now, we like to blame football for a multitude of sins, but I am here to tell you rowers led the way. Charles Elliott was the president of Harvard for 40 years, so I take him to be a reliable source. Elliott claimed that rowing became popular at Harvard because rowing down the Charles River was the easiest way to get from campus in Cambridge to the drinking establishments of Boston. I am very confident the first student to be injured after uttering the immortal line, "Hey, hold my beer and watch" this was probably a rower. When the NCAA, came into being at the turn of the century, the highest paid athletes were professional rowers and professional jockeys. Now, jockeys can still make a good living, but why is there no Monday night rowing? I am sad to say there is no Monday night rowing because the throwing of the rowing race, you only need to buy one rower. Rowers have ethics. When we got bought, we stay bought. Now, football may not have given birth to bar fights or bribery, but football did create the NCAA. The 1905 football season is alleged to have caused 18 deaths and 149 serious injuries. There were formations like the flying wedge where teammates locked arms together and literally ran over the opposing team. There were hurdle plays where the ball carrier was launched like a human cannon ball over the heads of the opposition. "Hey, hold my beer and watch this." After this 1905 season, President Theodore Roosevelt called the presidents of Harvard, Princeton and Yale to the White House and told them either to reform football or to abolish it. The presidents of Harvard, Princeton and Yale famously ignored the President of the United States, but 62 other schools sent faculty representatives to begin reforming the game. From these professional discussions, the NCAA was formed. After our daring predecessors tackled football, they took up the challenge of professional baseball. It was here that our stodgy bookworm predecessors drew a hard line. Young men who at any time could in the summer, except in pay for play would not be allowed to compete in intercollegiate competition. Had I been a professor in those days, I would have agreed with them. They wanted to create a fair and level platform for intercollegiate competition. Let me state for the record, I do not consider extra intercollegiate athletics at the Division III level to be extracurricular. I consider intercollegiate athletics at the Division III to be extra curriculum. If we are to promote the ideals of the scholar athlete, we must encourage our students to carry the lessons of the classroom into their athletic endeavors and lessons of their athletic endeavors into the classroom. In Division III, we balance the scholar with the athlete, and the athlete with the scholar. Our students learn endurance, persistence, discipline and resourcefulness. The Division III competition teaches them tolerance, adversity and comfort within certainty. These are not merely the qualities needed to succeed as athletes. These are qualities that underpin all of human achievement. After divinity school, I ran a shelter for homeless women. That experience led me to law school, which proves that rowers do things backwards. Most people go to divinity school after law school to atone for their sins. I got it backwards. Somebody said after I graduated, you can hang out a shingle "twice the

advice for half the price.” While I was in law school, I tried out for the U.S. Olympic team as a rower. I didn’t make the team for a simple reason, I was too slow. Not long after that, I found myself rowing a boat alone across the Atlantic Ocean without support vessels of any kind. I became the first American and the first woman to row alone across the ocean. I hope you can appreciate this. After skiing to the South Pole and rowing across the ocean, as president of Spalding University, I do not decide whether or not our students get a snow day. I make the provost decide whether or not our students get a snow day. I wrote a book entitled “A Pearl in the Storm” in an effort to explain the answer to a very simple question: why would you row a boat across the ocean? The book is used as a common read for a number of colleges and universities. President Ohle used the book. One year it was required reading at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy. The endurance, resourcefulness, discipline and persistence, I learned as a student-athlete at Smith College are the traits that carried me across the Atlantic Ocean, and these qualities served me very well in my life as a university president. So, why did Division III come to be and why did it happen in 1973, 121 years after the first intercollegiate athletic competitions? One answer to this question is deeply cynical. Walter Byers served as the Executive Director of the NCAA from 1951 to 1987. That is ‘51 to ‘87. In that time, he navigated the dual mission of keeping intercollegiate athletics fair and ethical while at the same time generating millions of dollars for colleges, universities and the NCAA as an organization. Mark Emmert talked about television. Walter Byers negotiated over 50 television contracts with CBS, NBC, ABC, ESPN and Turner Broadcasting. In the speech he made after his retirement, Byers said, “The management of intercollegiate athletics stays in place committed to an outmoded code of amateurism drawn up in 1956.” Now, ‘56 was the year that athletic scholarships, as we know them, came into being. Byers went on to say, “I attribute that to the neoplatation mentality that exists on campuses of our country and in the conference offices and in the NCAA that rewards belong to the overseers and the supervisors.” The neoplatation mentality rewards belonging to the supervisors and the overseers? I don’t know about you, but I don’t really like having colleges and universities referred to as plantations. It makes my head spin around in circles. We think about the young men who win NCAA Division I basketball and football championships, and there are rules that prohibit these young men from being paid for what anyone must recognize is heavy physical labor. Words like plantation and overseer shrivel the heart. In the same view in this room, we might be tempted to distance ourselves from such words. We, after all, are Division III. We are the division without division. There are a few monetary rewards for us to divide after all. But it is not in the nature of scholar athletes like the ones in this room to run away from difficult things. I may have opened this speech with a touch of smack, but I am not cynical about the NCAA. History always provides us with more than one side to any story. What if scholarships were approved by the NCAA in 1955, 1956, and this allowed the University of Kentucky, and I am from Kentucky, to pay their basketball team without actually paying their basketball team. The faculty at the time labeled athletic scholarships as an oxymoron. If the money was for athletic ability and not scholastic ability, these new instruments should not be called scholarships. They should be called athlete ships, or more pejoratively jump ships. The faculty controlled the remains of the norm in Division III schools was alive and well throughout higher education in the 1950s and 1960s. In those days, most coaches were members of the faculty. No president who valued his or her job would award athletic scholarships without faculty approval. In the ‘50s and ‘60s, members of the faculty were almost universally white men. I hope that you know that in 1972, when Title IX was written, the driving forces behind the legislation had nothing at all to do with athletics. Title IX was written because women were not being admitted to graduate programs. Women were not allowed to earn the advanced degrees that would qualify them to become college faculty. Title IX started the law against discriminate on the basis of sex in any education program activity receiving federal financial assistance. The athletic impact of Title IX was almost entirely accidental, not that I mind. Women have gained more economic success as professors than we have as athletes. In the 2013 Sports Illustrated list of the 50 highest paid athletes in the United States, there are no women. Let us return to the late 1960s when athletic scholarships really started to take off. Why would rooms full of white men, my father is a professor and he is the stereo typical pencil-neck geek, voted to award athletic scholarships to students, many of whom did not look like them? My dramatically uncynical answer is this: Vietnam. Men, like my father, didn’t care at all about March Madness. I think faculties voted to create athletic scholarships as a way to offer college deferments to a few young men so they wouldn’t be drafted to fight a war in Southeast Asia. I do not believe those professors were plotting to exploit or to make money for talented athletes. I think they were just

trying to save a few lives. Ironically, President Nixon ended the Vietnam draft in 1973, the same year the NCAA voted to split into Division I, II and III. Whether I wish to admit it or not, I think that athletic scholarships continue to save lives. Ninety-nine percent of college athletes do not turn pro, but every student-athlete has the opportunity to get an education along the way. When I give speeches about row boats or other back country expeditions, I enjoy talking about what I call the expedition equation. In the back country, ability and need find a balance. What we give to each person depends on his or her need, and what we expect from each person depends on his or her abilities. The superior becomes the servant, the strongest person carries the tent. As I prepared for this presentation, I came to understand that I learned this equation long before I ever climbed my first mountain. Perhaps it is not an expedition equation, perhaps it is a Division III equation. In the best of college athletics, where we give to each person, depends on his or her already needs; what we expect from each person depends on her or his abilities. The superior is of service. Can you imagine what our world would look like if we could transfer this ethic into the broader world? The thing we learn as athletes is persistence, endurance, discipline, resourcefulness are the very things we need to help us to face up to unpleasant truth and to change our world to the better. When my book "A Pearl in the Storm" was published, a marketing person describe my brand as that of the scholar athlete. I confess it made my smile. Scholar athlete is not just my brand, it is the brand of Division III. It is your brand, it is our brand. We must protect and defend it as our hallowed ground. When you return home, I know you will continue to teach, heal, lead and build. You will inform, advocate, comfort, guide. You will continue to criticize, organize and contribute. You will lead your students to find their paths, and in doing so you will perpetuate the ideals of the scholar athletes and the best hopes of Division III athletics, and for that, I thank you. *(Applause)*

Chairman Ohle: After 40 years, we have a great deal to celebrate. Tori, you have given us a great deal to think about. The history, the things that are happening today, trying to bring everything together back to the common denominator that we all have, and that is the student-athlete, and how we can provide for those students. If you have not read her book, and Tori doesn't pay me to be her promoter. As she mentioned, Gustavus Adolphus College used this as their common reader this year. Most of you have common reading programs of one sort or another on your campuses. Give this to your academic dean or your provost. Let them read it, and give them an opportunity to say to first year students, this is a great read. Tori was kind enough to come to our campus and spend a day with us and to visit with our students. It was one of the real hits of the academic year. The students are still talking about it. So, it is a great opportunity to get pick it up. As I mentioned, conventions also are about decision-making to better support our division and the student-athletes. We will turn to that in just a few minutes. Ced said that this is an association for student-athletes. As we look over here at our SAAC Group, who is celebrating their 25th anniversary, as I said at the business meeting the other evening, we are still unfortunately the only division that has SAAC represented on our Management Council with a vote. That is something we can all be proud of because these students deserve to be heard. *(Applause)*

That whole concept of student-athletes, as Ced mentioned, I want to take another raise of the hand just to get a sense of the group. I would like to see how many of us were involved at institutions. So, let's have all of the SAAC students or any other visiting student here raise your hand, and keep them up and we will see how many hands before we finish our raise. If you are a current student-athlete, SAAC and other visitors that are here, please raise your hand. Will you keep those up. Anyone who was a former Division III student-athlete like Tori, would you, please -- not those of us that are a little bit older, those that were active since we became a Division III, raise your hand. Look at that. Now, Ced, those of you that were around before Division III, that played and participated at a school that is now a Division III school, raise your hand. That is marvelous. Thank you so much. Remember what we are here for, and that is the student-athlete. The picture of our history of the importance of the division is the student athletic experience and the valued perspective that each of us bring to the governance of this division and to our Association, and the mentorship that you provide on your campuses and in your conferences. Ced and Tori, thank you again for the participation here at our 40th celebration. Please accept these small tokens of our gratitude and appreciation. We have something for you. I will bring them over to your way. It is a beautiful plaque that you can use. You can put it in your office, and it represents the 40th anniversary of the NCAA Division III. *(Applause)*

The development of our division's collaboration with NASPA, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, now commonly known as 360 Proof, focuses on the alcohol education and abuse prevention for all students. This is a landmark partnership for the NCAA Division III. It is actually unprecedented and very exciting. The initiative is now entering its second year of the final pilot phase. To briefly update you on the details, please join me in welcoming Leah Kareti, project manager and an NCAA Division III contractor. (*Applause*)

PRESENTATION BY MS. LEAH KARETI

Ms. Kareti: Thank you, President Ohle. Hello and good morning, delegates. My name is Leah Kareti. I serve currently as a contractor for the Division III governance, managing the development of 360 Proof. I have about 10 minutes this morning to update you on our program, including what it is, who has been involved in its development, program benefits and our launch. Now, 360 Proof is the name given to the web-based program for Division III and NASPA small college and university campuses to reduce the consequences of alcohol use, and just as importantly to enhance collaboration between athletics and student affairs. You have heard me or others update you on this program in the past, so you know that it was born out of the 2007 through '09 drug testing pilot, and the program itself is the response to a charge from our Presidents Council to focus the division's financial resources on the most vexing of campus health issues, the misuse of alcohol by some number of students on every Division III campus. This project is unique in that it includes a formal partnership with NASPA, one of the professional organizations for student affairs administrators in higher education, and for the first time we have had the NCAA involved in building a resource designed to support not only student-athletes but the student body as a whole. So, now please welcome a special guest to our business session this morning, NASPA president, Kevin Kruger. I would like to invite him up to share a few words about this collaborative effort from the student affairs perspective. Please welcome Kevin. (*Applause*)

REMARKS BY NASPA PRESIDENT KEVIN KRUGER

Mr. Kruger: Thank you very much. It is a pleasure to be here representing NASPA, which is 14,000 student affairs professionals around the campus, on all of your campuses as well. This is a great collaboration of the work we do in student affairs IN intercollegiate athletics. I just want to recognize Leah Kareti. She has been doing the work for the last three years, and Dan Dutcher and all his staff, the great partnership between NASPA and the NCAA. Ironically, the last three days I have been across the bridge over on Coronado Island where NASPA is having an alcohol abuse prevention conference. We had about 700 folks over there wrangling with this issue, which continues to be one of the most vexing issues that we face in higher education and why this partnership is so important. As you all know, there is no single approach that works best for this issue. We have to keep at it. In fact, it is usually a multi-disciplinary person has the most effect. Things like screening and multi-briefing, motivational interviews, peer education programs, officer directive programs that have outlined components, social forming. Actually, all the things that 360 Proof has embedded in it. I will tell you the science that is behind this program is really extraordinary. We have some of the best researchers in the country working on this, and I think will find this to be an extraordinary project. I want to say thank you from NASPA. We are very honored and pleased to be a part of this program and thank all of you and your campuses as we think about the work we do as student-athletes. We are going to be really impressed with the extent of this program in a way in which it addresses a very important program and problem. Thank you very much. I am glad to be here, and good luck with the rest of your meeting. (*Applause*)

PRESENTATION BY LEAH KARETI

Ms. Kareti: I have had a few folks ask me over the course of the past year what is that program you are building, what is 360 Proof? We wanted to share a brief update on that today. This is an entirely web-based program that is offered at no cost to all Division III institutions and both NASPA small colleges and

universities campuses. The materials in the program are designed to be flexible and responsive to the fact that all of our campuses, all of you in this room, began any program, and especially an alcohol abuse prevention program, with a different level of readiness to plan for and implement prevention strategies. You all have different goals and resources. We are building this program to accommodate those differences. Perhaps the most importantly, and something Kevin alluded to in his comments, is the fact that the program is evidenced formed. What that means in this context is that all of the tools and strategies included in 360 Proof have been demonstrated to be effective through empirical studies. There is a program tool that I will talk about in a moment that will also help your campuses take a look at the demonstrated level of effectiveness of whatever programs they may already be employing in their existing alcohol abuse prevention program. So, our portal offers three main tools. You can see in the diagram there on the left of the screen the campus program assessment instrument, on the bottom left, and the NIAA, or the International Institute for Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism recommended the strategies on the bottom right. Those two tools are focused at administrative staffs on your campuses. The third tool on the top of the diagram is a personalized feedback intervention. This is the one element of the program that is to be offered directly to students. Again, this is a customized track for student-athletes, but this is built for the full campus and all students therein. We have a series of short treating videos and in the accompanying guidebook in the program that prepares your campus contacts to implement the program. We have promotional tools to help drive student use in that personalized feedback inventory. So, you have three tools working together. The campus program assessment is really a self-study, and that is a program that will help an institution to take a look at what information it is collecting, and more importantly, what information should it be collecting. Then it helps, an institution to catalog its existing inventory and alcohol abuse prevention activities. So, the exercise there is really a self-assessment. There is not an external review, but again the program provides your campus infrastructure to engage in that review. As the next step program, the program helps institutions take a look at their existing activities and compare those to a DNI AAA recommendation from an evidence informed perspective. So, taken together, those administrative tools are really about helping your campus engage in planning in a collaborative manner between athletics and student affairs, and also pulling in other important partners across your campus. Finally, we talked about there is one student specific program within the portal, and this is the PFI. So, after engaging in the campus program assessment and looking at the strategic plan, if the school decides, yes, in fact, we want to offer personalized intervention to our student body, 360 Proof includes that tool to be offered directly to students. Essentially, the design of this is the student takes the web survey about their own drinking behavior and their perceptions about that behavior. They receive personalized feedback specific to them that provides some norms information and it provides them with strategies to reduce the consequences of their behavior. The act of taking the survey and reviewing the feedback that is empirically shown to change student behavior, believes like to warn right at the outset of this program, don't just implement the PFI. So, it is a great tool, but it is something that should be implemented within the overall context of the full 360 Proof platform. The tool itself has also been shown to help promote abstinence or support of students not currently choosing alcohol. We have a slide that talks a little bit about the PFI approach, the science behind that. I am going to pause for a moment to let folks review that slide. If the campus using the PFI has at least a hundred students take that survey, they will receive an aggregate report of the responses that their students have made in the PFI. Again, we have set a minimal aggregate level to make sure that all information is confidential for students who use the tool. So, I have already mentioned that this is a form of collaboration between the NCAA and NASPA, and we have heard from Kevin about that relationship. I do have on this next slide a shot of our Steering Committee, so you can see folks at the NCAA within NASPA and also within our membership who are involved in the direction of the program. Then on the next slide, we have our development team. This one is a little bit smaller. I will tell you who is on it. We have a handful of research experts. Kevin noted that we are working with the leaders in the field to use the science to develop an evidenced based program. I can't say enough about the quality of the people involved in this team. So, where you see a larger research institution name on the list, note that they are at the leading edge of what is going on in prevention, and they are building the content lines behind this model. We have a second team working on the program, which is essentially an implementation team. Where you see the long list of your Division III colleagues here, know that they are working on your behalf to translate the science into what that means every day on a Division III or other small college campus. So, we have

content experts and we have from Division III institutions' implementation experts coming together to help us build a program that is not only up-to date on the science side, but can be real and applicable and straightforward for all of you to use in your day-to-day lives. We are currently in the second pilot year of 360 Proof, and we have 36 schools helping us test the first draft of the full program design. I want to personally thank these 36 schools. Anytime you launch a website, we have seen a few examples of that lately in our country, and it is never as easy as you think it is going to be. So, I want to thank the 36 schools that are involved in helping us pilot this, not only for their commitment to athletics and student affairs collaboration, but for the time they have spent with me working through some of our design issues. I want them to know and I want everyone in the room to know that we have gotten a lot of feedback and we are making a lot of changes to our program design based on that. So, I want to thank this group for their patience and thank them for their commitment to the program. Before I go for today, I wanted to take one more opportunity to highlight again the benefits of the program. We are using your national resources to make this program available at a time when many federal, state and campus resources have become really scarce. The focus of our design from day one has been to include only programs or strategies with demonstrated effectiveness and to leverage economies scaled to effectively and responsibly use Division III resources. I think everyone in this room is aware of the common reporting lines between athletics and student affairs. This program offers a framework to drive collaboration on again what is the most significant issues on any college campus. Finally, we didn't go into detail about this part of the program, we, too, have a learning collaborative established where participating members are provided with some infrastructure to communicate and share with their peers and other institutions who are implementing this program. Where do we go from here? We are working on design updates based on the pilot. We will be launching this program in the next academic year. Next fall, all of our schools who helped us pilot this year and last year, they will get early access to the updated program, and then we launch for new registrants at this time next year. In January of '15, this is again the website. If all goes according to plan, we will be signing up new schools. For next year, the one item included that we didn't include in the current year pilot is a coach's model. One of the biggest learnings from the pilot was the role that coaches bring in impacting the behavior of their student-athletes. So, we will be offering a module for coaches to present information about how they should be communicating about alcohol, how they might be able to recognize when a student-athlete has a problem, and then understand how to refer that student-athlete to get help on their campus. Then, the big picture, if this program is successful, we are going to expand the substances beyond alcohol. Stay tuned, but we are looking at a potential launch of a program to ban drugs and street drugs targeting 2017-'18 academic year. I will pause briefly to see if there are any questions about our program for the good of the full group, and also note that I have a booth outside and across the foyer. Anyone who might have a few minutes after the Business Session, come on out and see this site. Any questions or comments today on the program? We will do a show of hands of things before I go. Could anyone on the Steering Committee or in the pilot schools raise your hand? I just want to note, that is the people who have been working hard the last couple of years to develop this program. So, thanks to all of you. *(Applause)*

Chairman Ohle: Well, on behalf of the Division, I would like to thank Leah for her hard work. And, Kevin, thank you for being here. This is really very special for us for you to take time to be here from your association meeting. I have to tell you that back in the early '70s, I was a card carrying NASPA member when I was associate dean of students back then. This is really an opportunity for all of us to engage across the campus on an issue that is extremely important, not just to athletics but to the entire campus. All you have to do is talk to your dean of students or vice president for student life, and you know how important this is. Thank you. *(Applause)*

Now, to review the remainder of today's agenda and our timetable. We will first conduct a test vote to ensure the voting machines are working properly. We will then review and adopt the Division III Official Notice and Program. The process will consist of a series of motions that we will explain momentarily. Once that process is completed, we will move on to the consideration of the three proposals included in the Presidents Council grouping Nos. 1 through 3. We will then consider the remaining proposals Nos. 4 through 10 and any related amendments. Again, we will use the voting units and conduct roll call votes on all 10 proposals, along with related amendments to motions. We believe the voting process will take approximately an hour, maybe

less if we can move forward. Time permitting, we will take then a brief break, at approximately 10:15, to allow additional time for the posting of voting results. Immediately after our break, we will come back and open the window of reconsideration for the morning votes. Any reconsideration will occur electronically, via roll call. After we finish reconsideration, at approximately 10:45, we will recognize members of special key governance committees. We then will elect our new Management Council members, and we will conclude the Business Session with an open forum providing you the opportunity to raise any issues or questions you have. Our goal is to finish by 11:00, but we will take as much time as necessary to conduct our business thoroughly and efficiently. Please remember that you will need both your voting paddle and electronic voting unit for any votes during today's Business Session. Our procedures dictate that all voting must be done by paddle or electronically, rather than by voice or hand. Please note that all voting procedures and instructions are located in the Official Notice and your registration packet. In addition, the Presidents and Management Councils have adopted a policy that we will use the electronic voting units to vote on all legislative proposals. In order to do that, it will be best to conduct a test vote now, to give us plenty of time to address any technical issues before we begin, because different from yesterday, now you will insert that card so that you have that in your machine. The units are very easy to use and we reviewed the process yesterday, and when I declare it is time to vote, simply press the button for your selection. Press "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The number you choose will appear on the L.E.D. window on the front of the key pad. It will only appear for a moment or two and will go out when your vote has been received by the system. If any time other than that the number you pressed appears in the L.E.D. window, please notify one of the voting technicians immediately. Their table is located to the side of the dais on your right. For roll call votes, a school-by-school and conference-by-conference printout of voting results will be posted on bulletin boards located at the back or immediately outside of the meeting room. That will occur as soon as possible after our initial voting concludes. During our break, we will do all we can to ensure an adequate break time prior to opening the window of reconsideration for those proposals. Finally, please remember to leave the key pads and Smart Cards at your seat in the ballroom when our Business Session ends this morning. If you happen to take the key pad or Smart Card with you, please return them promptly to the registration area or contact NCAA staff here at the hotel and they will make arrangements to pick it up. Is there any question about the electronic voting process? To be sure the units are performing correctly, let's conduct a test vote. Anyone having any problems casting their vote, please come forward. If you find something wrong with your machine, check it out with the technicians. Let's vote on the following question: Do you think the search function on the new ncaa.org website is better than before? Vote "1" for yes; "2" for no, or "3" to abstain. The voting is open. The polls are closed. At this point we will look at the results. 46.79 percent yes, and 53.21 percent no, with 147 abstaining. I think we are ready to proceed. The first order of business is to adopt the Convention Notice. The Convention Notice is the green and white colored booklet you received in November. Please note that any editorial corrections to the proposals in the Notice are published in the Legislative Services Database, also called the LSDBI. It is my understanding that we have no corrections this year. We will use the paddles to adopt the Notice, unless we get a vote that seems too close to call. When we vote to adopt the Convention Notice, we will vote on the proposals in the order they appear in those publications, unless they are reordered or have been withdrawn. If you intend to move to reorder a proposal, it will be the time to do so in just a few seconds, and I will highlight that. Please note that any reordering of any of the Proposals Nos. 1 through 10 also must occur via roll call, since all proposals are designated this year for roll call vote. So, we will use the voting units to deal with any reordering. Also, please note that by adopting the Notice, you are adopting all of the appendices found in the blue pages of the Official Notice. This includes three legislative appendices of note. First, are the interpretations in Appendix B, starting on Page 23, which are to be incorporated into the Division III manual. Second is the grouping of noncontroversial amendments in Appendix C, which starts on Page 25. Third is the modifications of wording based on intent, Appendix D, which starts on Page 43. All the amendments in these appendices all have been approved by the Interpretations and Legislation Committee, the Management Council and Presidents Council, and published in the LSDBI. We will not discuss any of them individually unless you ask to do so. If there is such a request, we will place those amendments "off to the side" and vote to accept the rest of the package first. We will then go back and discuss the individual proposals that were broken out for separate consideration, one by one, and vote on whether they should be approved. Approval is debatable and requires a majority paddle vote. Any proposals

removed from the package for separate discussion that are not subsequently approved are automatically referred back to the Management Council for further consideration. I know this is a complicated process, so are there any procedural questions before we begin? If so, the staff will be more than happy to answer those questions. Are there any questions? I will now ask for a series of motions from the floor to begin this process. First, I will ask for a motion and a second to adopt the printed Notice and Program for the Division III Business Session, so that we may proceed with our work. Second, I will ask for any motions to reorder proposals, and we will deal with them. And, third, I will call for motions to remove items from the appendices for separate consideration, if there are any. After we deal with those motions, we then will vote to accept the Notice and Program, as amended, if necessary. Is there any initial motion to adopt the Convention Notice?

Delegate Steven Beard: I am Steven Beard, Ursinus College. I move adoption of the Convention Notice. Chairman Ohle: Is there a second? Delegate Robert Antonucci: I am Robert Antonucci, Fitchburg State University. I second it. Chairman Ohle: It has been moved and seconded. Now, let's consider reordering. Are there any motions to reorder any of the Proposals Nos. 1 through 10? Hearing none, we have no motions to reorder them. Thank you. Now that we have determined the order of the proposals, are there any motions to remove any of the items to the Appendices B, C and D for separate consideration? Microphone No. 8. Delegate Kiki Jacobs: Good morning. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. My name is Kiki Jacobs, the Associate Director of Athletics at Springfield College, and chair of the new Management Compliance Committee. I am speaking on behalf of the NEWMAC membership, and we respectfully request to remove Proposal No. NC-2014-10 for separate consideration. Thank you.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you very much. We will now vote to accept, as I said earlier, the rest of the package of Appendices B, C and D, and then we will consider separately the item that has been brought before us, 2014-10. We will use the paddles. It is a very simple majority vote. All in favor of accepting the rest of the package, absent 2014-10, please raise your paddles; all opposed. Any abstentions? I think we have the vote. The motion has been approved. We will now discuss Proposal No. 2014-10 that was broken out for separate consideration. Approval of this individual proposal is debatable and requires a majority paddle vote. Microphone No. 9.

Delegate Patrick Summers: Good morning. I am Patrick Summers, Executive Director of the NEWMAC. The NEWMAC membership speaks in opposition to this proposal. Our membership dues are 100 percent increased and entertainment allows for hosting a prospective student-athlete without any discussion is excessive, an unnecessary increase to our institutions. We recognize that this is permissive legislation. However, at a time when financial implications at our institutions and at the NCAA are in the forefront of our discussions, this action places additional burden on the Division III membership. If we are going to increase additional resources, our priorities should be for our enrolled student-athletes. Thank you.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you very much. Any other discussion? Microphone No. 3.

Delegate Darryl Sims: Good morning. My name is Darryl Sims, Director of Athletics at the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh. I am also the chair of the Interpretations and Legislation Committee. We are asking the membership to keep this legislation in place and vote "yes" for the following reasons: 1990 was the last time we had an increase of this nature. We went from \$10.00 to \$20.00, and we all know that \$20.00 certainly doesn't get you what it used to over 24 years ago. Lastly, it is still up to the discretion of each member institution to decide whether or not they will adopt this piece of legislation, so, if it is really necessary for anyone that should oppose it, because you still have the opportunity to not adopt it at your own individual universities. For those reasons, we ask you to vote "yes".

Chairman Ohle: Thank you. Are there others to speak? Microphone No. 7.

SAAC Member Travis Misner: Good morning. I am Travis Misner, a former baseball athlete from Loras College and current chair of Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support non-controversial Proposal No. 10. The committee recognizes opposition to this proposal may be rooted in the institutional budgetary concerns. The current economic climate has had a significant impact on the institutions, and we appreciate the difficult task for institutions to prioritize and allocate funds. As a committee, we feel it is important for institutions to have the option, not the mandate, to provide additional funds for student-athletes to entertain prospective student-athletes. Increasing funds from \$20.00 to \$40.00 will allow student-athletes to host more flexibilities to entertain both on and off campus. The entertainment allowance legislation has not been reviewed since 2006. As we all know, costs tend to rise. The cost of pizza has increased, and the cost to go bowling or go to a movie has increased. The committee feels it is important to recognize the growing cost and allow the institutions the flexibility to provide additional entertainment expenses to the student-athlete hosts if deemed necessary. It is for those reasons we urge you to support non-controversial Proposal No. 10. Thank you.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you, Travis, and for the SAAC's discussion. Any other concerns? Any other voices to be heard? I see someone moving out there. They are going somewhere else. Seeing no other comments to be made, we will now vote on No. 2014-10. We will use our paddles. All in favor for approval, please raise your paddle. Thank you. All those opposed, please raise your paddle. Any abstentions? I believe from this view it has been approved. Thank you for your consideration. Let's now return to the original motion to adopt the Convention Notice. All in favor of adopting the Notice, as amended, please raise your paddle. Thank you. Those opposed. Thank you. Any abstentions? Thank you. The motion has passed. The 2014 Convention Notice is adopted and we thank you for that. It is now time to consider our various legislative proposals. I will lead you through the Presidential Grouping, and the chair of the Management Council, Terry Rupert will lead us through the remaining legislative proposals, which are included in the General Grouping. Today we will consider a total of 10 legislative proposals, which includes one resolution and related motions. These are Proposals 1 through 10 in your Convention Notice and Program Guide. The Presidents Council grouping consists of Proposals Nos. 1 through 3, and the general grouping consists of Proposals 4 through 10. We will begin with Proposal 1 and conduct a roll call vote, an electronic vote, for each of those as we move forward. Again, please note that several questions and answers of interest appear in the Q & A document that was attached to the recent Division III newsletter and included in your convention registration packet. These questions and answers affect every proposal. We covered the key issues during the legislative work portion of yesterday's issues forum, as well as I am sure the questions that you had have been legislative videos and meetings of the conferences. You have seen information in the LSDBI, and also please note that several of the proposals were included in the mootnicity memo, which the parliamentarian summarized earlier. There are also several other issues today. The rules do not permit an individual delegate to cease debate simply by walking to the microphone or by shouting and reciting the phrase "call the question." Rather, a motion to cease debate or a motion to move the previous question must be formally made and seconded. That is a non-debatable motion that requires a second vote and a two-thirds majority for adoption. If that motion is adopted, then we will move immediately to vote on the underlying proposal. If the motion to cease debate is not adopted, debate continues on the underlying proposal. One more point. The chair considers it unfair for an individual to move to cease debate or call the question immediately after he or she has made several comments regarding the merits of the proposal. In other words, if you want to move to cease debate, you simply do not engage in debate on the merits of the proposal as part of your motion. If you do so, the chair intends to rule that motion out of order. We are now ready to consider our Presidents Council legislative grouping. I see someone at microphone No. 2.

Delegate Herman Saatkamp: I am Herman Saatkamp, President of Richard Stockton College of New Jersey. As a member of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 1.

Chairman Ohle: We need a second. Delegate Chris Ragsdale: I am Chris Ragsdale, Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference. I second the proposal. Chairman Ohle: I have a second. Please proceed. Delegate

Herman Saatkamp: The health and safety of our student-athletes are paramount to each of us. Collectively, this three hard package focuses on upholding the NCAA principle of student-athlete well-being, which states it is the responsibility of each member institution to protect the health and provide a safe environment for each of the student-athletes. The three elements of the sports package work together to help us fulfill this responsibility. The designation of the team physician will help us establish the comprehensive plan consistent with the local community's standards. It will establish a strong foundation to meet the health and safety needs of our student-athletes requiring the safety certification for all of our full-time coaches and will ensure that the individuals working most directly with our student-athletes have the critical skills necessary to act if an emergency arises. Finally, mandating the reporting of the catastrophic injuries, near fatalities and fatalities, will give the NCAA's Sports Science Institute data to develop educational resources so that we can continually learn from this reporting and continually improve our safety measures for student-athletes. I would be indeed remiss if I did not note that the element that has seemed to garner the most attention, the designation of a team physician, is one for which at Richard Stockton College are keenly aware. We have a designated team physician. This appointment has been critical in bringing expertise and oversight to athletic training protocols, and establishing a holistic approach to implementing safety standards that are already required of us by our local community standards. The designation of a team physician is the foundation of this package, and it is critical to the safety of our student-athletes. For those reasons, I urge you to support each of the three elements of this safety package. Thank you.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you, President Saatkamp. That is very helpful. As Chair, I am moving to or proposing that we separate each of these three subparts of this proposal, unless there is objection, and they are related but separate issues. I believe we deserve to hear discussion on each part. Hearing no objection, we will first consider Subpart A of Proposal No. 1. Is there a discussion on Subpart A? Microphone No. 5, President Edmondson.

Delegate Charley Edmondson: Thank you. Good morning to all. I am Charley Edmondson, President of Alfred University, Alfred, New York.. We are a member of the Empire Eight athletic conference, I am also speaking today as a member of the Presidents Council. I speak in support of the comprehensive proposal, but in addition I would like to particularly solicit your support for Subpart A, specifying the reporting of the catastrophic injuries. If defined as fatalities or near fatalities such injuries are blessedly few in number each year, but for those of you, who like me, have been associated with a fatality in intercollegiate athletics, you know how devastating your effect can be on an institution and on the sport in general. Therefore, it is more important than I can articulate that we have as much information as possible about these injuries. They not only will help guide our trainers and coaches in knowing how to monitor the health and well-being of their student-athletes, and I can also speak from personal experience of involvement in a biomedical project involving the possible redesign of equipment in violent sports such as ice hockey, lacrosse, football. The necessity of having good information about these most serious of injuries is vital to our making athletics safer for all student-athletes in the future. I do not believe this constitutes a burden on existing athletic staffs, because we estimate that there are on the average about 60 fatalities across all sports every year. Therefore, this is rare and unlikely to pose a burden.

Therefore, I solicit your support in behalf of Subpart A of Proposal No. 1. Thank you. Chairman Ohle: Thank you, President Edmondson. Are there any other comments? Is there any other discussion that we would like to have on Subpart A? Microphone No. 3. Delegate Tim Gleason: I am Tim Gleason, Commissioner of the Ohio Athletic Conference. If I could just ask the Chair a question for a point of clarification, please. Chairman Ohle: Yes, Tim. Delegate Tim Gleason: On abstentions and how they count or not count, looking at Robert's Rules of Order, suppose the vote was 105 affirmative and 100 negative, and 200 abstentions, would the vote carry because the affirmative outweighed the negative, or would it not carry because the affirmative would not be in the majority of all those voting? Chairman Ohle: It is my understanding as chair that abstentions do not count. I had a discussion with the parliamentarian this morning on that. Anything that you would like to add? Parliamentarian Taggart: Just a comment. The majority is defined as the majority of those present and voting. An abstention is not a vote.

Chairman Ohle: Does that help, Tim? Delegate Tim Gleason: Yes. Thank you. Chairman Ohle: Thank you. We are now ready, then, to vote on Subpart A of Proposal No. 1. I am sorry. We have another comment. Microphone No. 7. Thank you for getting my attention.

SAAC Member Amanda Ingersoll: Good morning. I am Amanda Ingersoll, Stevens School of Technology, lacrosse student-athlete. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Part A, reporting of catastrophic injuries and fatalities of Proposal No. 1 as it helps to support the health and safety interests of student-athletes. Why would we vote for this? The proposal asks our institutions merely to provide data, data that can help our institutions to provide a safer environment for their student-athletes. Why would we vote for this? This data is not expensive. It may take some time to report, but that is the extent of the expense and hopefully these reports are few and far between. While reporting may be minimal, the benefit is significant. By requiring this reporting, the NCAA will have access to a larger data set by which to identify trends in catastrophic events among student-athletes. More importantly, equip the NCAA with crucial data on which catastrophic injury prevention plans, programs and policies will be based. Subpart A of this sports safety package protects student-athletes' well-being and for this reason we urge you to support Part A of Proposal No. 1. Thank you.

Chairman Ohle: I want to thank the SAAC for their reference to this proposal. Seeing no other comments to be made, let's take the vote. Remember, vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. The vote is 451 yes, or 95.35 percent, and 22 no. Thank you. It is adopted. Now, we want to move to Subpart B of Proposal No. 1. Is there any discussion on Subpart B? Yes,

President Herzberger. Delegate Sharon Herzberger: My name is Sharon Herzberger, President of Whittier College, and a member of the SCIAAC. As a member of the Presidents Council, I rise to support Proposal No. 1, Subpart B, the designation of the team physician. At the core of the NCAA's philosophy and mission is the responsibility of all member institutions to provide a safe environment for the student-athlete and to provide medical care that is in accordance with best practices and community standards. Teams' physicians serve a vital need to all of our institutions, and this proposal will require an institution to designate a team physician who shall be authorized to oversee the medical services incidental to student-athletes' participation. The sports safety proposal preserves institutional autonomy by allowing the institution to determine the specific duties of the team physician, and if the team physician can serve in a voluntary or a fee-based system. The team physician may be involved with the institution's certified athletic trainers in developing health and safety protocols and emergency action plans. This is so important to our health and well-being of our athletes. This legislation is not requiring a team physician to be at every practice and competition. So, we are autonomy to decide the very best way of implementing this is to preserve. Institutions are already held to national, state and local rules and regulations, and laws and community standards of all sorts, and we are required to provide for the health and safety of our athletes. This proposal will ensure that we are abiding by a standard that we are already held to and it will demonstrate our commitment as a division to protecting student-athletes while preserving this important institutional autonomy. For these reasons, I strongly encourage you to vote in support of Proposal No. 1, Subpart B.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you, President Herzberger. I see there are others interested in the discussion. Let's go to Microphone No. 10, first, and then we will go to No. 12.

Delegate Pamela Trotman Reid: Thank you. I am Dr. Pamela Trotman Reid, President of the University of St. Joseph, Connecticut, and a member of the Presidents Council and also a member of the Great Northeast Conference which, by the way, is the winner of the Division III inclusion and diversity award. We are very proud of that. Like most institutions, we also have physicians designated to oversee protocols and on call to serve our student-athletes. Although the intent of this proposal is made clear, I am advised by our university counsel I oppose this proposal. The word "oversee the medical services for injuries" legally implies the presence

of the physician. Also, on advice of my athletic director, we oppose this proposal because we currently have two physicians. This proposal imposes some confusion about who will have the final authority in medical decisions. Further, we question whether the team physician can or should overrule a student's individual physician if that person were to be brought in. In short, we suggest confusion in this wording leads us to ask you to vote no.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you for your comments. Microphone No. 12.

Delegate Tom Chema: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Tom Chema, President of Hiram College, and we are a member of the North Coast Athletic Conference, and I serve on the Presidents Council on behalf of whom I speak. The designation of a physician ensures that we as an association are making it clear that the health and the safety of our student-athletes is of the utmost importance, and that the protocols for medical services we provide to our student-athletes will be appropriately supervised. As our keynote speaker, Dr. McClure, said earlier today, our Association ultimately was founded around the safety of our student-athletes. We have an opportunity today to show that that spirit of Theodore Roosevelt is still alive and well in the Association. Many of our institutions already have a designated team physician, and while some institutions may incur initial burden in establishing this relationship, it seems that any such burden does not exceed the importance of making sure that we do not compromise our institutional policies and procedures for providing medical care to our student-athletes. The proposal maintains institutional autonomy, and I would suggest that it is not at all confusing in how it provides the opportunity for us to provide appropriate supervision, and it respects the nature of the relationship between the institution's autonomy, the physicians and the specific duties of the physician. This proposal does, however, ensure that we have an integrated approach to establishing medical protocols and guiding policies for the health and safety of today's student-athletes, a necessary condition of student-athlete safety that we should all endorse. For these reasons, I encourage your support.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you, President Chema. Microphone No. 4.

Delegate Lori Runksmeier: I am Lori Runksmeier, Director of Athletics at New England College. As a member of the Management Council and the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport, I urge you to support Proposal 1, Subpart B, designation of a team physician. This proposal will give our institutions a great deal of autonomy while still maintaining the core principle of the legislation, which is to protect the health and safety of our student-athletes. You will be able to determine whether you want to designate one physician, multiple physicians, or one practice with multiple physicians. You will be able to determine if you want to designate affiliated or institution or establish an arrangement with an outside physician. You will determine the details of the arrangement with your physician. You will determine the specific duties of your team physician doing what is in the best interest of your institution, your athletic trainers, and your student-athletes. Designating a team physician ensures we are providing medical services for our student-athletes in accordance with best practices and community standards. When considering your vote today, I urge you to think about what is in the best interest of your student-athletes and vote for this proposal.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you for your comment, Lori. Microphone No. 7.

SAAC Member Audrey Hester: Good morning. I am Audrey Hester, Randolph-Macon College, lacrosse student athlete. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 1, Subpart B. The primary purpose of Subpart B is to ensure that the medical services being provided to us as student-athletes are overseen by a licensed physician. We understand that there may be financial implications in adopting Subpart B. We also understand that there are concerns regarding the duties of the team physician, but none of these concerns outweigh the fact that Subpart B of the proposal aligns with the NCAA principle of student-athlete well-being, specifically by promoting student-athlete health and safety. By designating a team physician ensures that a physician is overseeing medical services and additional medical accountability means a healthier and safer environment of the Division III student-athletes. For these reasons, we urge you to support Subpart B

of Proposal No. 1, the designation of the team physician. Thank you.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you for articulating SAAC's position. I see no one else at the microphones. Any voices to be heard? We are now ready to vote on Subpart B of Proposal No. 1. Please cast your vote. "1" is for yes; "2" is for no; and "3" is to abstain. The polls are open. The polls are closed. Yes, 406, 88.26 percent; no, 11.74 percent. There are 54 in opposition. Thank you for your votes. The proposal is adopted. Now, we are ready to hear discussion on Subpart C of Proposal No. 1. Microphone No. 8.

Delegate Lex McMillan: Good morning. I am Lex McMillan, President of Albright College, and currently chair of the mighty MAC Conference. Speaking on behalf of the Presidents Council in support of Proposal 1, Subpart C, concerning CPR, AED and first aid certification for all full-time employees who are coaches. Expanding our existing legislation to require all coaches and not just head coaches that are employed full time by the institution to have basic safety certifications, CPR, AED and first aid provides another critical layer of safety for our student-athletes. Sudden cardiac death is the leading medical cause of student-athlete deaths and represents 75 percent of all sudden death cases that occur during training, exercise or competitions. In an emergency situation, the typical emergency response time is eight to ten minutes, and survival rates decrease 10 percent every minute. This proposal will increase the likelihood that someone working closely with student-athletes will have these safety certifications and if needed can act more quickly in an emergency. Even with athletic trainers and other skilled personnel available, emergency situations often require multiple rescuers, therefore, having additional coaching staff that are CPR, AED and first aid trained will provide additional assistance to the other rescuers and ultimately help save lives. For these reasons and others, I ask you to join me in support of this proposal.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you, President McMillan. Are there other points of discussion, other voices to be heard? Seeing none, we are ready to vote. All those please vote as we have before. "1" is for yes; "2" is for no; and "3" is to abstain. The polls are open. The polls are now closed. The vote is 462 for, 98.3 percent; 8 opposed, 1.7 percent. The proposal is adopted. That concludes Proposal No. 1 with all three parts. We now move to Proposal No. 2. Microphone No. 6. I could have heard your voice without this mic.

Delegate Robert Antonucci: Is that better? That's great. Wake up, everybody. Here we go. I am Bob Antonucci, President of Fitchburg State University, and as a member of the Presidents Council, I move proposal No. 2.

Chairman Ohle: Is there a second? Delegate Terry Rupert: I am Terry Rupert, Wilmington College. I second the motion.

Chairman Ohle: I have heard a second. Please proceed.

Delegate Bob Antonucci: I urge you to support this proposal as it is in the best interest of Division III student-athletes. The current penalty for testing positive for a non-performing drug is the loss of a season of competition and a year of eligibility. This proposal would reduce the sanction from 365 days to a withholding from 50 percent of competition in the next season in all sports. The data suggests that those that test positive for non-performance enhancing drugs have to sit out an entire year often do not stay with the program and frequently withdraw from the institution. Reducing the penalty provides an incentive for the student-athlete to stay embedded in school with his or her team and participate in campus intervention education, counseling and treatment. This new penalty is significant. More importantly, it puts the proper focus on student-athlete welfare. For this reason, I urge you strongly to support Proposal No. 2.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you, President Antonucci. I think we will go with Microphone 7, and then we will go to Microphone No. 9.

SAAC Member Julian Dunn: Good morning. My name is Julian Dunn. I am a cross country track and field student- athlete. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 2. As a member of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I want you to think about these questions. What is the true purpose of the penalty for a positive drug test for a non-performance enhancing drug, and does that purpose outweigh the benefits of having an appropriate punishment that still allows for intervention and education? Data shows that many student-athletes do not return to competition and even drop out of school after testing positive for an NCAA non-performance enhancing drug, more commonly known as street drugs. Consequently, many opportunities are lost for institutions to educate these student-athletes about drug use, provide with rehabilitation services and ultimately improve the student-athlete's general health, safety in athletics, academic and personal well-being. Furthermore, by reducing the penalty for the use of street drugs to a 50 percent withholding allows the institution the discretion and the autonomy to address an issue of drug use based on its institutional mission, policies and procedures. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee does not make light of illegal drug use, but truly believes this legislation is in the best athletic, academic and personal interests of the student-athlete who tests positive for street drugs. For these reasons, we urge you to support Proposal No. 2. Thank you.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you for articulating the SAAC's position. President Forsythe.

Delegate George Forsythe: My name is Barney Forsythe. I am the President of Westminster College in Missouri, and a member of the St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I speak on behalf of the Presidents Council in support of Proposal No. 2. As President Antonucci stated, this proposal is in the best interest of the student-athlete. What also should be clear is that the proposed reduction does not equate with a lack of concern over drug use. The 50 percent reduction proposed is still a significant penalty and deterrent. It is one of the highest penalties of any sport's governing body. Furthermore, institutions and conferences are free to impose greater restrictions if they deem it appropriate. The primary focus of this proposal is the benefit of student-athletes in regard to continuing their education and retaining engagement with their team. But the penalties are significant and that should not be lost in this discussion. For these reasons, I encourage you to support Proposal No. 2. Thank you.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you, President Forsythe. Any other discussion, other voices to be heard? Microphone No. 4.

Delegate Charles Harris: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I am Charles Harris, Executive Vice President at Averett University, and representing the USA South Athletic Conference. As a member of the Management Council, I rise to speak in support of Proposal No. 2. Currently, the penalty for testing positive for a performance enhancing drug is the same as testing positive for a non-performance enhancing drug. The penalty is both the loss of a season and participation, and a year of withholding from competition. We should not treat these two distinct violations in a similar manner. The impact on the competition, as well as on the individual's performance is different between performance enhancing and non-performance enhancing substances, and the penalty should be different as well. For these reasons, I urge your support of Proposal No. 2.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you, Charles. Seeing no one else at the microphone, we shall vote. Please cast your vote. "1" is for yes; "2" is for no; and "3" is to abstain. The polls are open. The polls are closed. The vote, 318 for, 68.39 percent; 147 opposed, 31.61 percent; eight abstentions. The proposal is adopted. The next proposal is Proposal No. 3. The microphones are open. Microphone No. 6. Delegate

Amy Carlson: I am Amy Carlson, Commissioner of the American Southwest Conference. The American Southwest Conference and the Southern Athletic Association co-sponsors the Proposal No. 2014-3, proposing an amendment to Bylaw 17.9.6.1 that would allow permissible use of the helmet in the non-competitive spring football season. The proposal came forward in an effort to provide the football student-athlete use of

his basic piece of sport equipment, to assist in refinement of skills while developing a sense of limitations of those skills found helmeted. As witnessed yesterday in the Issues Forum, any discussions conducted among presidents, governance councils and committees, commissioners, conferences and on our campuses, there is keen interest in the helmet proposal. In the lively documentary, pro and con, there is both information and misinformation about the intent and the rationale. The SAAC, the voice of our student-athlete, wrestled with the impact of the proposal on the football student-athlete, eventually settling at no position. Out of the discussions bigger questions come to the forefront. Can we provide a meaningful spring session for today's football student-athlete that builds sports skills, strengthening and condition, education on safe techniques, and is an equitable activity compared to non-traditional activities in other sports? To allow for an honest and continued look at Bylaw 17.6.9.1, by all football stakeholders, the American Southwest Conference and the Southern Athletic Association respectfully withdraw Proposal No. 2014-3 for consideration by the membership. We challenge those stakeholders to engage in an open and forward thinking dialogue about Bylaw 17.6.9.1, assisting in the dialogue that is being undertaken by the Division III membership of the American Football Coaches Association, with conversations taking place without the drum beat of what is the next thing they will want? With the goal of answering, are we providing quality educational and athletic opportunity in the non-competitive section for today's football student-athlete? We thank you.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you for your thoughts and seeing no opposition, the Chair rules that it will be removed without opposition. That concludes our initial consideration of the proposals in the Presidents Grouping. I want to thank you personally. At this point, Terry Rupert, as Chair of the Management Council, will lead us through the remaining proposals.

Terry. Chairman Rupert: Thank you, President Ohle. Good morning. Are you still with me? All right. We will now proceed with seven proposals in the General Grouping. Again, we will consider these by roll call, using the voting units. Our next proposal is No. 4. Microphone No. 4.

Delegate Bruce Delventhal: My name is Bruce Delventhal. I am the Director of Athletics at Plattsburgh State University, and a member of the State of New York Athletic Conference. On behalf of the sponsoring schools in Proposal No. 2014-4, and the support of the Management Council, I would like to propose Proposal No. 2014-4.

Chairman Rupert: I consider that as a motion. Do I have a second?

Delegate Stan Ching: I second the motion.

Chairman Rupert: We have a second. Please proceed.

Delegate Bruce Delventhal: This proposal would help to standardize the practice starting date for Division III hockey prior to and allow for a contest prior to November 1st, and at the same time enhance and ensure that the proper acclimatization period and the safety of our student-athletes. Currently, the first contest is on November 1st, and there is no time allowable for a scrimmage or other contest prior to November 1st to have our student-athletes ready to compete. Also, our starting date jumps around the calendar. By using this starting date, we would always be starting on a Monday. It would not, in fact, shorten the hockey season, but just allow for a standardization of the starting date.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 3.

Delegate Steven Nelson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am Steven Nelson, Director of Athletics at the University of Wisconsin, Superior. As a member of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 4. Ice hockey is a sport that is historically conducted in intercollegiate competition on weekends. The recent

changes to the ice hockey playing and practice season legislation moved the first permissible contest date to November 1st in an attempt to allow student-athletes the time to properly condition themselves and be protected from premature exposures of the full rigors of competition. Having specific dates, however, did not always ensure proper conditioning, and it has caused some scheduling concerns. We are coming back now with a better model to encourage proper acclimatization and discourage mid-week contests. By establishing the third Monday in October as the first practice date, the second Friday thereafter is the first contest date, along with the required acclimatization period, it preserves the intent of allowing student-athletes to properly condition while allowing the institutions to maintain the custom of holding competitions on weekends. Establishing a framework that maintains weekend competition, it helps avoid mid-week contests, thereby reducing the missing class time for the student-athletes. For these reasons, I urge you to vote in support of Proposal No. 4.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you, Steve. Microphone No. 4.

Delegate Aaron Quinn: Good morning. I am Aaron Quinn, Director of Athletics at Middlebury College, a member of the New England Small College Athletic Conference. I stand in opposition to Proposal No. 4 specifically out of concern for the five-day acclimatization period, specifically due to its impact on two sport athletes. As an example, field hockey student-athlete joins the ice hockey team of a fall sport. You begin ice hockey practice on a Monday in peak physical condition following the fall, completes four practices by the end of the week, but with this legislation she is ineligible to participate in a Friday game or a Saturday game. Maybe worse, I can imagine she and her coach may be inclined to create extra practice sessions simply to comply with this standard. Due to this provision, I would not support Proposal No. 4. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 1.

Delegate Tracey Ranieri: I am Tracey Ranieri, Director of Athletics, State University of New York at Oneonta. As a member of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 4. The focus on recent legislative changes in the sport of ice hockey has been unensuring the health and safety of our ice hockey students, and by creating a two-week delay between the first practice date and the first contest date. This proposal maintains an approximate two week time period between the first permissible practice date and the first permissible contest date. Additionally, this proposal establishes the high date of acclimatization period for each student-athlete. A five-day acclimatization period is consistent with football, the only other sport that has an acclimatization period, and is supported in concept by the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sport. Additionally, allowing a scrimmage exhibition or joint practice prior to the first regular season contest allows student-athletes to be exposed to a more realistic level of competition, yet not to the full extent of a regular season competition. Because student-athletes' health and safety is our priority, I encourage you to vote in support of Proposal No. 4.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you, Tracey. Microphone No. 7.

Delegate Nafeesa Connolly: I am Nafeesa Connolly, a student-athlete at Simmons College. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 4. The proposed restructuring of the playing and practice season for ice hockey creates several benefits for student-athletes. First, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee believes there are inherent health, safety and well-being benefits for requiring a five day acclimatization period. This proposal ensures each individual student-athlete has an opportunity to acclimate the intense physical demand of competition. Additionally, allowing for one scrimmage or exhibition contest prior to the first regular season contest provides an opportunity for learning and development of the individual athlete and as a team. Lastly, changes to the first permissible contest and regular season contest date will ensure that competition continues to be held on weekends, thus minimizing the impact of missed class time. For these reasons, we urge you to support Proposal No. 4. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you for the SAAC's position. Microphone No. 11.

Delegate Jamie Marcoux: Mr. Chairman, I am Jamie Marcoux, Johnson and Wales University. I am in support of the pre-season scrimmage and allowing our student-athletes a period of acclimatizing to the sport. My concern is that by adjusting the start date, it may allow for an additional weekend of competition, but it reduces the number of ice pre-season practices for hockey from 16 to 11. I ask you if reducing the number of days for practice opportunity in an acclimatization sport is in the best interest of our student-athletes. Our hockey student-athletes do not have the opportunity to go down to the gym and shoot pool. Yes, they can train before getting on the ice on their own, but it is not on the surface that they compete on, and I feel they need this extra time to properly train and prepare for the demands of their upcoming season. My other concern is that by allowing the competition on that additional weekend, it falls in that late October-early November period, where we are still in the middle of our playoffs for conference championships for our fall team. As we talk about work life balance, I question what that will do to my staff as we are trying to balance fall championships, and now we could potentially be hosting hockey games on that same weekend. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Any other comments? Seeing no one rising, we are not prepared to vote on Proposal No. 4. Please cast your vote, "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. The results are 204 for yes, 32 opposing. Proposal No. 4 is adopted. Our next proposal is Proposal No. 5. Microphone No. 9.

Delegate Tracy King: I am Tracy King, Commissioner of the Liberty League. I move Proposal No. 5.

Chairman Rupert: It has been moved. Do I have a second? From the Floor: I second it.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Please proceed. Delegate

Tracy King: This proposal, which is consistent with the current legislation in the sport of soccer for its field hockey student-athletes up to three scrimmages or exhibition games prior to the first scheduled contest. These additional pre-season scrimmage opportunities provide these student-athletes with an opportunity to train, practice and improve their skills in a game setting prior to the first contest. It is important to note that this proposal neither lengthens the playing season nor adds dates of competition as any scrimmage or exhibition game counts towards the institution's limit of 20 contests. As co-sponsors of this legislation, the Liberty League and the State University of New York Athletic Conference ask for your support of Proposal No. 5.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 4.

Delegate Brian Williams: I am Brian Williams, Commissioner of the State University of New York Athletic Conference. I stand in support of Proposal No. 5. This legislation would afford field hockey student-athletes the same opportunity currently experienced in other sports. Currently field hockey is allowed only one day in which to scrimmage during the pre-season period. This proposal would allow up to three scrimmages or exhibition games before the first day of competition, providing such flexibility in the sport of field hockey would allow the student-athletes to adequately prepare for this reason in a manner like other sports. I urge support of Proposal No. 5. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Seeing no one else going to the microphones, we are now prepared to vote on Proposal No. 5. Please cast your vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The results are 285 for, 4 no, 178 abstentions. Proposal No. 5 is adopted. We are now ready for Proposal No. 6. Microphone No. 6.

Delegate Kurt Beron: I am Kurt Beron, Faculty Athletics Representative, University of Texas, at Dallas. As a member of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 6.

Chairman Rupert: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

Delegate Nancy Meyer (*Calvin College*): I second it.

Chairman Rupert: I have a second. Please proceed, Kurt.

Delegate Kurt Beron: Current legislation allows scouting at exhibitions but not scrimmages. However, lately there is no distinction between these two types of contests. As a result, institutions wishing to scout must rely on the institutions participating in the contest to define the event. The result is an arbitrary distinction. We could legislatively define the difference, but the bigger question needs to be asked should we allow pre-season scouting at all? Is it a good use of our resources? It doesn't increase enrollment. It doesn't enhance the experience for our current student-athletes, rather it results in more time away from campus for our coaches. For these reasons, I encourage you to support Proposal No. 6 and to eliminate scouting at all pre-season contests regardless of how the contest is defined.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you, Kurt. Microphone No. 7.

SAAC Member Dominec Fraboni: Good morning. I am Dominec Fraboni, Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota, football student-athlete. The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 6. The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee believes this proposal reduces competitive inequity and improves the work life balance of coaches and ultimately enriches the student-athlete's experience. Specifically, current legislation does not clearly define the difference between an exhibition contest and the scrimmage. Consequently, participating institutions have the discretion to determine if the athletics event is an exhibition contest or scrimmage, thus, dictating whether other institutions may scout the event. The committee believes this discretionary definition of event causes an inherent competitive advantage for some institutions and conversely a competitive disadvantage for others. This proposal will ultimately provide institutions with the consistent application of scouting legislation. Further, this proposal will also encourage coaches to spend more time on campus with their student-athletes and their team during the pre-season, which is a crucial time period for new teammates as well as building team cohesiveness. For these reasons, we urge you to vote in favor of Proposal No. 6. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you for sharing the SAAC's position. Microphone No. 1.

Delegate Steve Larson: Mr. Chair, I am Steve Larson, Commissioner of the Northern Athletics Collegiate Conference. I speak against this and urge you to vote against it. As an old former coach as well, when Division III institutions have the opportunity to play an exhibition game, in most cases it is against the Division I institution. The college game would basically support their institution, not for scouting the game. I think quite frankly this is ludicrous legislation and differentiation needs to be made to define the difference between an exhibition game and a scrimmage game. We all realize that we can't scout scrimmages, but there is a great opportunity for colleagues to go support, and it is quite frankly to play an exhibition game against a Division I school you are not going to get a lot of scout out of it. In talking to the athletic directors and coaches in our conference, as well as in our commissioner's meeting, coaches go to support their teams and have the opportunity to play these games, not to scout. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you, Steve. Microphone No. 6.

Delegate Janine Hathorn: I am Janine Hathorn, Director of Athletics at Washington and Lee

University. As a member of the Management Council, I stand in support of Proposal No. 6. Current legislation already prohibits scouting at scrimmages, so the base question is do we need to do in-person scouting at exhibitions during the pre-season? If yes, then vote against this proposal. But if you feel all scouting during the pre-season, scrimmages and exhibitions, is unnecessary, then vote in support of this proposal. Scouting costs money. It keeps coaches away from campus, and it can create longer hours for our coaches. We are looking for competitive advantages, but I don't think it is necessary to scout scrimmages or exhibition contests, and technology makes it even less necessary. This legislation will also allow coaches to stay closer to campus, which is much more positive to the coaches and the institution. When considering your vote on this proposal, I challenge you to consider the cost versus the benefit of scouting and exhibitions, and how that weighs on our coaches and impacts our student-athletes. As a member of the Management Council, an athletic director, and a former coach, I do not believe that the benefits outweigh the cost, and I encourage you to vote in support of Proposal No. 6.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you, Janine. Microphone No. 3.

Delegate Gary Barnard: I am Gary Barnard, Commissioner of the Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I want to echo a couple of things that my commissioner colleague Steven Larson stated. A lot of times these are show-case events, show-case events not only for the institution that is playing, but for the conference, and quite frankly all of Division III. To preclude other coaches from going to those events seems to me to be an overreach. Quite frankly, I don't have a problem making a distinction between a scrimmage and an exhibition game. I think that is something that we can work out. I think that is something we can formulate. You talk about cost savings, you talk about time away from campus, then I encourage those who believe this is inadmissible to do what we do in the WIAC. We don't allow scouting during the regular season. You talk about cost savings and away from campus, that has a much greater impact than an exhibition game. So, I would again encourage the membership to step back from this, allow us to look at it, allow us to come up with a meaningful way to distinguish between these two events, and to vote "no" on this proposal. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you, Gary. Microphone No.16.

Delegate Al Bean: I am Al Bean, Southern Maine. I would like to support what Gary and Steve Larson have said, because I think there is a need for a definition of exhibition and scrimmage. I think most people understand that the coaches don't need to be at scrimmages, but with some of the new opportunities that are out there, you are telling a coach out of interest that they can't go see something that is different, something that is special. I am not sure that is what we really want. Recently this year, as a prime example, our women in basketball had an exhibition game at the University of Maine. They were opening a new facility. It was great interest in the opening of that facility. A good number of coaches in the state were there, not for the scrimmage, but just to see the building, to see what took place. I think there is some work to be done in discerning what the two are. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you, Al. Any other comments? Hearing none, you are now prepared to vote on Proposal No. 6. Please cast your vote "1" for yes, "2" for no, "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. The results of the voting, 303 yes, 157 opposed, 12 abstentions. Proposal No. 6 is now adopted. We move to Proposal No. 7. Microphone No. 8.

Delegate Chris Ragsdale: I am Chris Ragsdale, Commissioner for the Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference. As a member of both the Management Council and the Division III Membership Committee, I move Proposal No. 7.

Chairman Rupert: Proposal No. 7 has been moved. Do I have a second?

Delegate Tracey Ranieri: I second it.

Chairman Rupert: I have a second. Please proceed.

Delegate Chris Ragsdale: Currently, NCAA legislation does not limit the number of times a single gender institution that is transitioning to a co-educational institution and adding an athletics program for the underrepresented gender may be granted a three-year waiver of the sports sponsorship requirements. Although the number of waivers being requested from single gender institutions in recent years suggests that schools may need more than three years to transition to co-educational status. Institutions still must make a concerted effort to establish compliance with our Division III sports sponsorship requirements in a reasonable time frame. A six-year period is sufficient time for transitioning institutions to establish a population robust enough to support athletic teams in the underrepresented gender. Adopting this change will also provide some definitive time frame to encourage institutions that are considering transitioning to a co-educational model to review their plan holistically and involve their athletic departments early in the process. For these reasons, I urge you to vote for Proposal No. 7. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you, Chris. Microphone No. 7. Delegate

Bill Murabito: My name is Bill Murabito, President of Morrisville State College, which is a member of the North Eastern Athletic Conference. We had a lengthy discussion at our Presidents Council about the proposed legislation regarding waivers. The discussion was led by Dr. Barbara Mistick, President of Wilson College, one of our conference members who was, in fact, in the transition process. Currently, there are 52 institutions of single gender. Fifty of those are women colleges. Some of them will engage in this process, most will not. Transitions involves a long difficult journey. The introduction of new sports requires planning and continued effort. While some institutions may attempt to gain this system, others may have difficulty beyond their control. One good example of this is the approval of academic programs. If you were in your waiver period and you required a new academic program to help, we all know the lengthy process for that to happen. The current policy allows the NCAA to approve a waiver when warranted, and reject when necessary. Why would we ever reduce our flexibility? For this reason, we respectfully move that the proposed legislation be referred back to the Management Council's Membership Committee for further study.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. We have a motion to refer Proposal No. 7. Do I have a second?

From the Floor: I second it.

Chairman Rupert: We now need to vote on the referral. Is there any further discussion on the referral before we do that? Hearing none -- I am sorry, Microphone No. 3.

Delegate Donna Ledwin: I am Donna Ledwin, Commissioner of the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference. The AMCC would like to see this proposal referred back to committee. We believe the waiver, as it currently exists, permits reasonable accommodation for unique circumstances in what is a significant change for any single gender institution transitioning to co-education. We believe this proposal warrants further review and would strongly recommend the Membership Committee consult with the leadership of a variety of single gender institutions to gain a wider understanding of the challenges such a transition might entail to make such a change to this waiver rule is warranted. We assume this is not so time sensitive that reconsideration would not be reasonable. Please vote to refer. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 6.

Delegate Terri Deike: My name is Terri Deike. I am the Director of Athletics at LeTourneau University in Longview, Texas, and also serve as the Chair of the Division III Membership Committee. On behalf

of the Membership Committee, I encourage you to oppose the motion to refer to committee. In its review of this issue, the committee recognized the need for balance for providing institutions sufficient time to meet sports sponsorship requirements, while at the same time ensuring that these institutions are adhering to the Division III philosophy relative to broad-based athletics programs, that all Division III institutions must satisfy. Specifically, if a single gender institution decides to transition to a co-educational institution, it is only reasonable that within a certain amount of time the institution will be required to meet the same sponsorship requirements that other co-educational institutions must satisfy. In the committee's opinion, six years is a sufficient amount of time to meet this responsibility. As such, the Membership Committee respectfully requests that you oppose the motion to refer and support this proposal. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Anyone else? On the floor, we now have a motion and a second to refer Proposal No. 7 back to the Membership Committee. That is what we will be voting on at this time. If the motion passes, it will go back to the Membership Committee for further study. If it is defeated, we will then vote on the original proposal. Any questions on that? Hearing none, then we will vote on the proposal to refer. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. The motion to refer, 185 yes; 244 no; 36 abstentions. The motion to refer has been defeated. We will return back to the original Proposal No. 7. Microphone No. 9.

Delegate Julie Soriero: Thank you. My name is Julie Soriero, the Director of Athletics at MIT, and a member of the New England Women and Men's Athletic Conference. As a member of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 7. Some transitioning Division III institutions have strategic plans for growth with models that are well designed, which have a process longer than three years. While those schools should not be put into immediate risk of having their membership terminated simply for endeavoring to broaden their student population, they also need to be mindful of our membership standards in making the transition. Limiting waivers to a maximum of six years balances a single gender institution's need with Division III requirement that members are offering broad-based athletic programs consistent with the Division III philosophy. For these reasons, I urge you to vote in support of Proposal No. 7.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you, Julie. Microphone No. 7.

Delegate Keith Hillkirk: I am Keith Hillkirk, Chancellor of Penn State, Berks. On behalf of the membership of the North Eastern Athletic Conference, again we urge defeat of this proposal and speak in favor of its return to the Management Council's Membership Committee. As you have heard, given the challenges and complexities of our 52 single gender institutions face, if and when they move to a co-educational structure, we believe that this issue demands further review and deliberation. We also believe that current rules are appropriate and should be enforced. We urge defeat of this proposal.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you, Keith. Seeing no one else at the microphones, we are now ready to cast our vote on Proposal No. 7. You vote "1" for yes; "2" for no; and "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The results of the polling, 364 yes; 62 no; and 44 abstentions. Proposal No. 7 is now adopted. We move to Proposal No. 8. Microphone No. 1.

Delegate Tracey Ranieri: I am Tracey Ranieri, Director of Athletics at State University College at Oneonta. As a member of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 8.

Chairman Rupert: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

Delegate Charles Harris (Averett University): I second the motion.

Chairman Rupert: We have a second. Please proceed.

Delegate Tracey Ranieri: This proposal is designed to help grow the sport of women's rugby and hopefully increase the number of female participants in Division III, allowing institutions to use a combination of seven a-side competition, which is the Olympic format, in addition to the current 15 a-side format will aid institutions in meeting sports sponsorship requirements. Allowing both formats will give institutions the flexibility based on location and the availability of opponents to schedule and meet the minimum contest requirements. Additionally, allowing the use of contests against collegiate club teams in a limited manner provides another layer of support for the sport. We should take action to encourage the growth of women's rugby and female participation. Please vote in support of Proposal No. 8.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 4.

Delegate Tim Ryan: Good morning. I am Tim Ryan, Director of Athletics at Bowdin College, a member of the New England Small College Athletic Conference. We support women's rugby as a varsity program on our campus. I will briefly speak to you in favor of the proposed legislation. The proposed legislation accounts for revolutionary growth in women's rugby and allowing for adjustments in the method for counting contests, specifically using dates of competition to more accurately account for and promote the growth of seven rugby, which will be an Olympic sport in 2016. In addition, the proposed legislation provides additional flexibility for institutions to meet minimum contest count requirements as the sport continues to grow within our membership. For these reasons, I hope the membership will vote in support of the proposed legislation. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 5.

Delegate Dean Snider: I am Dean Snider, Director of Athletics at Whitman College, and a member of the Northwest Conference, and a member on the Committee of Women's Athletics. I speak in favor of this proposal. It is designed to help grown the emerging sport of women's rugby by realizing this is a seven a side game, and the emerging sport program that is growing opportunities for women on our campus, and we believe this is a sound strategy to that end, and the Committee on Women's Athletics urges you to support this program.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Any other comments? Microphone No. 2.

Delegate Joe Bednarsh: I am Joe Bednarsh, Director of Athletics, Yeshiva University. We do not sponsor rugby, but I do have some concerns with this legislation in allowing varsity teams and club teams to compete and have those dates count. I think we need to think a little bit more about the precedent we are setting, having a varsity team to compete against the club team, which is not under the same rules and restrictions as the varsity teams. We can't really be sure who is on those club teams. We can't regulate their academic success, and we can regulate their eligibility.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 6.

Delegate Brit Katz: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I am Brit Katz, the Vice President and Dean for Student Life at Millsaps College in Jackson, Mississippi. As a member of the Management Council, I speak in support of Proposal No. 8. While this proposal increases the maximum women's rugby contest limits from 10 to 15 dates of competition, the legislative change has a potential to reduce travel and missed class time. The seven a-side format is much different than the current 15 a-side format. Significant differences is that 7 a-side contest consists of two, seven minute halves versus two, 40 minute halves for the 15 a-side format. The shorter competition allows the institution to play multiple contests on one day and count all those contests towards sports sponsorship requirements. While student-athletes may play more contests, those contests are shorter and confined to fewer days. This proposal is good for rugby, good for our institutions, and good for female scholar athletes. For these reasons, I urge us to support Proposal No. 8. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Any other comments? Hearing none, we are now ready to vote on Proposal No. 8. Vote “1” for yes; “2” for no; and “3” to abstain. The polls are open. The polls are closed. 178 yes; 37 no; 240 abstain. Proposal No. 8 is adopted. We will move to Proposal No. 9. Microphone No. 5.

Delegate Terry Wansart: Good morning, or good afternoon, I am not sure. I am Terry Wansart, Director of Athletics at Hunter College, and a proud member of the City University of New York. As a member of the Management Council, I move Proposal No. 9.

Chairman Rupert: Terry, it is still morning. The proposal has been moved. Is there a second?

Delegate Tracey Ranieri: I second the motion.

Chairman Rupert: It has been seconded.

Delegate Terry Wansart: In an emerging sport is a sport recognized by the NCAA to help schools provide more athletics opportunities for women and allows the sport and the university to grow sponsorship to a championship level. Triathlon already has significant support across the country, including many of our member schools, and has shown considerable growth over the last several years. By recognizing triathlon as an emerging sport, we can build off of the existing support, and help create additional participation opportunities for women at the Division III collegiate level. This proposal does not require anything of you. It will not require you to sponsor triathlon, but it will allow you to count triathlon as a sponsored sport if you already have it or would like to add it. Further, women who participate in triathlon will not be using a season of competition in cross country, track and field or swimming. This proposal needs and deserves our support. I urge you to vote for Proposal No. 9.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 8.

Delegate Debbie Warren: Yes, good morning. My name is Debbie Warren. I am the Director of Athletics at Marymount University in Arlington, Virginia, a proud member of the CAC. We have already added the sport of triathlon on our campus. We consider this the quintessential sport for our students as biking, running and swimming, our lifelong pursuits. Our newest student-athletes are focused, disciplined and humbled by the opportunity to choose this experience. I ask you to join me in support of growing this amazing opportunity. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 5.

Delegate Dean Snider: I am Dean Snider with Whitman College, the Northwest Conference, and a member of the Committee on Women's Athletics. In response to a question posed at yesterday's session, the CWA did approach the swimming and cross country committees about their perspective on the proposal and as it related to their sports. Neither registered any objection. The emerging sport program is working to develop opportunities for additional women to participate on our campuses, and in this case we believe even if there is some overlap in the initial stages, as the sport grows, specific triathletes will be registered on the rosters and the various well established sports in cross country, swimming, and track and field will continue on very strongly. For this reason, we urge you to support this proposal.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 7.

SAAC Member Connor Passalacqua: I am Connor Passalacqua, State University of New York Institute of Technology, a baseball student-athlete. As a member of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, I

urge you to support Proposal No. 9. Simply put, this proposal will create more participation opportunities for female student-athletes. Data indicates that female participation in triathlon has increased over the last 20 years, and there is a growing demand for collegiate triathlon participation opportunities among prospective and current female student-athletes. By sponsoring women triathlon as an emerging sport, it will also allow additional participation opportunities for female student-athletes who prefer to combine their skills and talents in three sports instead of isolating the focus on individual sports such as swimming, cross country or track and field. For these reasons, we urge you to support Proposal No. 9. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you for giving the SAAC's position. Anyone else? Hearing none, we are now ready to vote on Proposal No. 9. Please cast your vote. "1" is for yes; "2" for no; "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are now closed. The results are 394 yes; 29 no; 46 abstentions. Proposal No. 9 is now adopted. We move to the last proposal, Proposal No. 10. Microphone No. 3.

Delegate Donna Ledwin: I am Donna Ledwin, Commissioner of the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference. On behalf of the Allegheny Mountain Collegiate Conference, the North Coast Athletic Conference, the Commonwealth Coast Conference, and the Empire Eight Athletic Conference, I would like to move Proposal R-2014-10.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. We have a motion. Do we have a second?

From the Floor: I second it.

Chairman Rupert: I have a second. Please proceed.

Delegate Donna Ledwin: The proposed resolution seeks practical accommodation of the expense and planning that is involved when rules changes are made. While we recognize the need for evolution of playing rules, implementation must occur in a way that is sensitive to the constraints of those institutions who must manage their budgets very carefully, in what has been and will continue to be challenging economic times. Despite numerous requests from the Division III membership on multiple occasions over the past several years, PROP continues to improve rules changes with immediate or very short-term effective date that are not in sync with our institutional budgets or planning processes. While we appreciate PROP's pre-convention announcement that it would be more attentive to such concerns going forward, the response does not go far enough. PROP, not the Sport Rules Committee, as they have suggested, needs to be the arbiter of these effective dates. It is our understanding that our colleagues in Division II share like concerns and are making a similar request to the Playing Rules Oversight Panel. We ask your support of this resolution to bring our message to PROP with the unified Division III voice. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 4.

Delegate Troy VanAken: I am Troy VanAken, President of Thiel College, and we proudly compete in the Presidents Athletic Conference. As a member of the Management Council, I rise in support of this resolution. Often playing rules changes are adopted and subsequently communicated to the membership that require immediate or near immediate implementation. These playing rules changes can have a significant facility and/or financial impact for Division III institutions. Just over the last few years, those of you that have been at this convention will recall rule changes in the three point line, microphones for officials in football, backyard lighting and similar things that had an immediate implementation. While it is understandable that playing rules should be the same across all three divisions, the immediate implementation of new rules can have a disparate impact for Division III schools, especially from a budgeting perspective. This resolution is not about objecting to the rules, but rather seeking more flexibility in implementing changes so as not to create undue financial or facility hardship for our institutions. The Management Council supports the resolution sponsors and are encourag-

ing PROP to recognize the practical differences between divisions and adopt a policy allowing schools a year to implement changes where there is a financial impact or modification to a facility. Certainly, any rule change that directly impacts the safety of student-athletes should be implemented immediately, and this resolution would not delay rule changes that directly impact student-athlete health and safety. The Management Council supports this proposal and I encourage you to do the same.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you. Microphone No. 12.

Delegate Keri Luchowski: My name is Keri Alexander Luchowski. I am the Executive Director of the North Coast Athletic Conference. I would like to briefly agree with my colleagues that every change that we have had recently in rules seems insignificant when considered alone. However, when taken in succession, the scope of the problem becomes apparent. PROP has continually approved rules changes as unfunded mandates often based on what is happening in other divisions without consideration of the ramification for Division III and without consideration of our budget and planning cycles. We appreciate PROP's recent conversations on this topic. However, I feel they're only beginning to understand the issues of Division III. We feel very strongly that rules changes to improve the conduct of sports are appropriate, and in the case of the student-athlete or spectator safety are encouraged. However, we should proceed in a fiscally responsible manner. For these reasons, we also ask for your support for this resolution. Thank you.

Chairman Rupert: Thank you, Keri. Anyone else? Hearing none, we are ready to vote on Proposal 10. Please cast your vote, "1" for yes, "2" for no, and "3" to abstain. The polls are now open. The polls are closed. The results of Proposal No. 10, 458 for; 6 against; and 2 abstentions. Proposal 10 is now adopted. With the results of that resolution, that concludes our first round of legislative action. I will now turn this back over to President Ohle.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you, Terry, a job well done. I am going to take a little privilege as your Chair. We have been recording the votes ourselves. We do need to have a break. There is a required break in the schedule to prepare for any reconsideration. However, the votes are so far in the positive and to the affirmative, we believe that there is very little chance of a reconsideration. However, we will give you that opportunity to come forward and have us reconsider if that is what your wish is. We will take your word that you have been on the positive side to have this happen in order to bring it back up. It would take us at least 15 minutes to get the record out there for you to look at. We don't need to do that, I don't believe. I will take a little bit of a privilege here. We are going to take a five-minute break. Anybody that has a reconsideration, please come forward, and then we are going to go right into the final parts of the program. There are some votes we have to take. So, I would appreciate you coming back right away and we will be able to do that. Let's take a break. (*RECESS*)

Chairman Ohle: Let's find our chairs. I know there are still a few out in the corridor, but we would like to get moving. We received absolutely no requests for reconsideration. However, in fairness to everyone and in fairness to the rules, I want to make sure that if there is someone who is still considering or wants to reconsider, would you, please, raise your paddle and let me know so that we can move forward? I see no paddles. What a great morning, what a great set of legislation. I want to thank Randy and Jeff for the work they did in advance of this meeting. I leaned into both of them and said, boy, this is the easiest you have had it in years, and I then said, and we discussed the fact that we do believe we are preparing ourselves better for these meetings with the legislation. So, I want to thank them. I also want to thank Louise and Dan. (*Applause*)

Now, I want to thank the members of the Convention Planning Committee. The subcommittee met several times during the past year to craft our meeting agenda and to be sure that it is responsive to the membership feedback and interests. As I said yesterday at the Issues Forum, I think we are making a lot of headway in getting information out so that people can talk about it for a period of time. Please keep your convention format, content and timing in mind when you receive and complete the post-convention evaluation form. The subcom-

mittee relies on your feedback to help make the convention a positive experience. In fact, right after this meeting, there will be a meeting of the new Management Council and they will begin that process, getting ready for next year. The subcommittee is chaired by Nancy Meyer, Director of the women's athletics program at Calvin College. The full membership of the subcommittee appears on the screens. Please note that, and if you know any of them, please thank them. Will the subcommittee members please stand so we can thank you with an applause. (Applause)

Second, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Presidents Council and the Management Council for their very hard work during the past year. It has been a privilege to work with the members of both councils, and the great working relationship between these groups continues to serve Division III and the Association, I believe, very well. I would like to acknowledge the Council members who are completing their terms of service at this convention. There is the Management Council. Steve is completing his term, Stan is completing his term, and Tim and Portia. Then one more, Dalaine. Let's thank them for their service. (Applause)

Chairman Rupert: I have been told that we need to make sure we do everything right. We need to go back and open the window of reconsideration formally, and we want to make sure we have done that. So, right now we will formally open the window of reconsideration for any proposals that were adopted before the break, all 10, or actually 9 since one was withdrawn. Hearing none, the window is formally closed. (Applause) Chairman Ohle: Now, the outgoing members of the Presidents Council. Fred, I still want to get you to take that "s" off of there. Fred Ohles, Nebraska Wesleyan University, and I will be retiring and leaving the Council myself. I think that takes care of that, doesn't it? (Applause)

The groups have spent literally hundreds of hours in their personal and professional time meeting their very important responsibilities in representing you in our governance structure. This is something that I hope you will consider. There is no way I ever thought of being here, standing at this podium, when I was in those chairs. Get involved. Be part of the governance. We talk to the students all the time about doing that, and they do a fantastic job, but it also takes responsibility from those of us who are at our campuses. I hope you will do this. There is another group, in particular, that assisted the Councils during the past year that I would like to mention. That is the Presidents and Chancellors Advisory Group. This group helps to assure that the presidents from every Division III conference has an opportunity to assist the Presidents Council and the Management Council with their leadership responsibilities and likewise work with fellow conference presidents to address important athletic issues at all levels. Presidential leadership remains a top priority for the Presidents Council, and the Presidents Advisory Group continues to play a crucial part in assuring that presidents are exercising appropriate leadership in intercollegiate athletics, especially in our 43 voting conferences. You have seen the names of those that are outgoing PAG members, and your conference is represented on this Presidents Advisory Group, and it is extremely important. In particular, I would like to thank them for their service, so let's give them a round of applause. (Applause)

If any of those members are here, please stand so you can be recognized. I know some of them had to catch a plane. I also would like to acknowledge those who served in the NCAA Governance Structure beyond the Presidents and the Management Councils and the Presidents Advisory Group. We are truly a membership association with over 130 standing committees, and many other special committees. It is only through the hard work of committee members and hundreds of people that the business of the NCAA, and particularly Division III, can be accomplished. If you have served on any NCAA committee during the past year, please stand and let's recognize you. (Applause)

Thank you for your commitment to the Association and Division III. It is only through you that the work of the Association can be accomplished successfully. If you are interested, as I said earlier, please make sure that you make that known to the staff, because they will see that you are involved in a committee or get involved in the governance. The final group I would like to acknowledge are those who have hosted NCAA championship competitions during the past year. Having been president of two institutions when we have hosted some of the championships, I know how much work it takes. It doesn't take a lot of work on the president's part, it takes a lot of work on all of yours. I tell you that is appreciated. Our championships do not take place without that great

deal of work and many individuals are involved. The hard work results in the quality championships experience for the student-athletes. If you were on the staff of a school or conference office that hosted any round of NCAA championships during the past year, please stand so we can recognize you and thank you for your service. *(Applause)*

Under the governance structure, we need to ask the Nominating Committee to present the names of the new Management Council. I recognize Mike Vienna.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Delegate Mike Vienna (*Salisbury University*): Thank you. On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I would like to thank the Division III membership for their interest in serving in the NCAA governance structure. The committee encourages you to get involved in Division III committee service. You can contact members of the Nominating Committee or Sharon Tufano, NCAA Coordinator at the NCAA national office for further information about service opportunities. Now, I would like to move the slate of nominees for service on the Division III Management Council. It will be the reappointment of R. Brit Katz, Vice President and Dean of Student Life, Millsaps College. Troy VanAken, President of Thiel College. The reappointment of Nnenna Ako-taobi, Senior Woman Administrator, Swarthmore College. Dennis Leighton, Faculty Athletics Representative, University of New England. Gerald Young, Director of Athletics, Carleton College. And Frank Millerick, Director of Athletics, Becker College, who is not on the official ballot but we wanted to acknowledge him as an interim appointee. Thank you.

Chairman Ohle: Thank you, Mike. The committee's nominees have been moved by the committee. Is there a second?

Delegate Steve Nelson (*University of Wisconsin, Superior*): I second it.

Chairman Ohle: Are there any nominees from the floor? We can use our paddles for this process. All in favor, please hold your paddles up; all opposed; abstain the same. You officially now have the new Management Council, Sharon, for the next year. Please stand up if you are here. We'd like to thank you personally, the members that have just been elected. There we go. *(Applause)*

The slate is approved, as I said. Please note that we have two new appointments to the Presidents Council, as well as three new members who were approved by a mail vote of the Division's presidents this fall. The new appointees are Christopher Howard, Hampden-Sydney College, and Zorica Pantic, Wentworth Institute of Technology. That's it. The three presidents approved by mail vote, you have met some of them, are Jay Lemons, Susquehanna University; Lex McMillan, Albright College; and Lynn Pasquerella, Mount Holyoke College. I want to formally welcome these members to the Presidents Council for next year. *(Applause)*

Chairman Rupert: It is now my pleasure to recognize Microphone No. 11, our incoming Chair of the Presidents Council, Sharon Herzberger.

President Herzberger: Thank you, Jack. We can't let this moment go by without recognizing you as you conclude your service as Chair of Division III. We need to point out a few things, so we have them highlighted right up here in bold view. If I am correct, you began your service, your leadership service to the NCAA in 2006 on the Management Council, and I counted up to perhaps nine or ten committees, councils, subcommittees that you have served on and led since then. In my time of knowing you, I have heard you speak so long of your roots as a student-athlete. You have brought your memories and the perspective that you have gained through those experiences to two vice presidencies and two presidencies. Your upbeat attitude, your enthusiasm for the role of athletics on our campuses, and your respect for student-athletes are truly infectious, and we all want to thank you for your service, your dedication and your leadership. So, thank you. Please join me in thanking Jack. *(Whereupon, the assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)*

CLOSING REMARKS BY PRESIDENT OHLE

Chairman Ohle: Well, as I stand here before you, I realize that I am looking really at those people that make this Association so important. As I said, I have had an opportunity to sit on that side of the podium also, and I want to thank you. Not one of us in this room do this for the recognition. We would not really do well if we did it that way. So, as I end my time with the NCAA, and as many of you know, I am retiring from Gustavus Adolphus College at the end of this academic year. My wife, Kris, and I are looking forward to retirement with our family and our grandchildren and enjoying some time. I was reflecting that 16 years as a president and as a vice president or president since 1977, it is time for us to take the step back and to enjoy watching you. I promise you I will keep close to the NCAA staff in the sense of learning how things are going and watching the proposals each year, and if you come to San Diego again I may just come out to see you. This is a gorgeous place. I said to the Presidents Council when I ended, and I won't spend but two minutes here, that I feel today that I am blessed because I have gone full circle. I started as a student-athlete. I actually started participating in Steubenville, Ohio, in football when I was in the second grade. I was involved in athletics all through high school and college, and I have been involved as a coach and I have been involved as an administrator ever since. I have come back now to have a little bit of a chance to pay back. I remember when I was in college the coach came up to me and said, "Jack, you are a fairly good football player and you are going to have a good time here at Ohio Northern." And I was able to play in my freshman year. In order to make progress he said, "But one thing you have to do is you have to be a better student." It wasn't that I was a poor student. He knew I was not reaching my potential. That changed my life. Little did I know I would ever become a president at two institutions and have the opportunity to serve. That's what we do. We do that every single day of our lives, whether we are on a campus or in a conference office, engaging people about sports and talking about the integration of athletics and how important they are. Now, I speak passionately on my own campus about those who are participating in speech and forensics, and the band and the choir, and all those other co-curricula integrated components of institutions like ours. So, yes, we are here talking about athletics, but it is about the student and the things we face as institutions today with the pricing of higher education, the demands we have on making sure resources are available, are very, very difficult, but it is because of the work of people like you and people in those other areas that are so important to our institutions. We do it for these young people, we do it for the people who are participating on our campus in all of those activities. So, as I leave this podium, I want to challenge the SAAC members to know that you have a chance, if you stay in higher education, to be here and here, to be involved in something where you can give back. If it isn't an education, it is in your job and what you do. Always think of giving back. So, blessings to all of you and I thank you for all you have given me. The meeting is now adjourned. (*Whereupon, the meeting was duly adjourned at 11:30 o'clock a.m.*)



**Each year, more than 450,000 NCAA
student-athletes gain skills to succeed on the field,
in the classroom and in life.**